	N7i5aleS	ned 00/01/25
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	New York, N.Y.
4	v.	22 Cr. 325 (JPC)
5	EDDY ALEXANDRE,	
6	Defendant.	
7	x	
8		July 18, 2023 2:00 p.m.
9		2.00 p.m.
10	Before:	
11	HON. JOHN P. CRONAN,	
12		U.S. District Judge
13		
14	APPEARANCES	
15	DAMIAN WILLIAMS United States Attorney for the	
16	Southern District of New York BY: NICHOLAS FOLLY	
17	JARED P. LENOW Assistant United States Attorneys CHIESA SHAHINIAN & GIANTOMASI PC	neys
18		-
19		
20	BRITTANY A. MANNA	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	I	

```
N7i5aleS
               (Case called)
1
2
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Can counsel, starting with the
3
      government, please state your name for the record.
 4
               MR. FOLLY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Nicholas
5
      Folly and Jared Lenow for the government.
6
               THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Folly, and Mr. Lenow.
 7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

MR. BOVE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Emil Bove for Mr. Alexandre, who is seated to my right, and I also have with me Brittany Manna an associate at my firm, and Nicole Verdi who is a summer associate, who will join us, with the Court's permission.

THE COURT: Verdi?

MR. BOVE: Verdi.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Manna, Ms. Verdi, and Mr. Alexandre.

Let me just make sure I am pronouncing it correctly, it is Alexandre not Alexandre; is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Alexandre.

THE COURT: Alexandre, great.

So, we are here this afternoon for Mr. Eddy
Alexandre's sentencing. Mr. Alexandre pled guilty before me on
February 10, 2023, pursuant to a plea agreement with the United
States Attorney's office. He pled guilty to Count One of the
indictment. That count charged him, from the period of
September 2021 through May 2022, in engaging in commodities
fraud in violation of Title 7 U.S.C. Sections 91 and 13(a)(5),
Title 17, Code of Federal Regulations Section 180.1, and Title
18 U.S.C. Section 2.

I will start by running through the materials I have received and reviewed in preparation for today's sentencing. I will ask everyone's patience as there were quite a few

materials.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First, I have reviewed the presentence investigation report dated May 25, 2023. Appendix A to the presentence investigation report is a document with information, that document contains data for the defendant's final offense level of 37. So, that document has data for defendants who had a final offense level of 37 pursuant to Section 2B1.1 and Criminal History Category I, which are the offense level and Criminal History Category that probation arrives at for the defendant. I have also reviewed the addendum to the presentence investigation report which addresses various objections to the presentence report raised by the defense. have reviewed Mr. Alexandre's lead sentencing submission dated July 5, 2023, that is at Docket no. 86. This includes a 45-page brief from Mr. Bove and approximately 1,100 pages of attached documents. Those attachments start with a letter from Mr. Alexandre himself and is followed by many letters in his support including from his wife, his mother, family members, and about 500 other letters and e-mails from people who knew the defendant in Haiti or met him in the United States including members of his church, or as well as a large number of EminiFX investors. And I suspect a large number of the authors of those letters may be in this courtroom and in the overflow courtroom today and I do thank you for your letters, I have read all of them in advance of today's proceeding.

that two correspondences appear to be written in French; an e-mail from Marie Thomas and an e-mail from Jemps Meigan. I do not have translations of those e-mails but if either of those individuals wish to speak today, and ideally if necessary that their statements be translated, I will be happy to hear from them. I will also address anyone else who wants to speak in a few moments.

There were several other materials attached to the defense submission. There is an article on Haitian political history in the 1980s, a March 2020 e-mail thread between Mr. Alexandre and the CFTC regarding Mr. Alexandre's creation of the CFTC portal account, an e-mail thread from May 2022 concerning defendant's employment of Robert Xiong and Robert Perelman; July 28, 2022 and September 16, 2022; letters from the government as well as summaries of witness interviews, a fiscal year 2022 statistical information packet from the Sentencing Commission, three status reports from the receiver in the CFTC civil lawsuit against Mr. Alexandre pending before Judge Caproni; those reports are dated May 15, 2023; February 15, 2023; and October 12, 2022; there is a May 2022 e-mail thread between the defendant and a Jeffrey Perelman, and a spreadsheet purporting to show EminiFX employees.

The publicly-filed version of the defense submission contains redactions of certain personal information of the authors of some of the letters and other limited redactions in

the attachments and I reviewed those.

I also have reviewed the government's lead sentencing submission of July 12, 2023, that is at Docket no. 88, that submission also includes several exhibits. Attached are recordings of investor meetings on May 5, 2022 and April 2, 2022; exchanges between an investor and an EminiFX customer service agent regarding the affected investors' deposits, an EminiFX PowerPoint presentation, a sealed FBI report of a victim interview, a sealed e-mail exchange and FBI report regarding a house purchase and letters from victims. I believe there were about five letters from victims attached. Those victim letters were originally filed under seal but now have been filed on the public docket with the sender's personal information redacted. And I have reviewed the redacted as well as unredacted or sealed versions of those materials as well.

I also have received a submission from the parties that follow the government's submission. I received two letters on July 13, 2023 from Mr. Bove; the one at Docket 89 concerned the sealed and restricted treatment of certain attachments to the government's submission and the one at Docket 90 concerned the government's failure to previously produce, whether in discovery or otherwise, Exhibit B to the government's submission which was the recording of the April 28, 2022 investor meeting. And I have reviewed the exhibits attached to that letter at Docket no. 90 as well which involve

the various exchanges between the government and Mr. Bove regarding discovery.

I also reviewed the government's July 13th, 2023 response regarding his production of a video of the April 28, 2022 investor meeting which is at Docket no. 93. I directed the government to file a supplemental declaration on that issue which the government submitted to me yesterday and filed earlier today.

I have also reviewed the government's response regarding the sealing of certain materials. The government submitted that response on July 14th, and this letter also attached three more exhibits which I have reviewed. Those exhibits are notes from an interview of a purported victim, a summary of a recording of the defendant speaking to various victims, and a report of an FBI interview of the victim who provided that recording. And I have reviewed the defendant's reply on July 15th.

As the docket reflects, after reviewing those materials and the documents themselves, I found yesterday that sealing of Exhibits N through P, and F through H, of the government's submission, was appropriate.

Now, I have also reviewed a July 13 letter from Mr. Bove filed under seal concerning a request to strike Exhibit J to the government's sentencing submission. That letter attached one exhibit also filed under seal which was a

May 26, 2023 e-mail. Given my ruling that Exhibit J should be unsealed, I will also order that Mr. Bove's letter of July 13 on this issue to be unsealed and I will ask you, Mr. Bove, to file that on the docket, because the letter discusses a witness, I authorize redactions of any references to the witness' name or other personally identifying information in that letter and the e-mail. Also, I have reviewed the government's response to that letter which the government filed on July 17.

Then, most recently last night, I received a sealed letter from the government concerning information purportedly from another investor including notes pertaining to that person's information. In addition, over the past few weeks I have received in my chambers e-mail correspondences from a number of purported victims of this offense. I have provided those to the parties and I have posted them on the docket with redactions to the names of the senders and any other personally identifying information and those are posted at Docket no. 98, and just not too long before this proceeding started,

Docket no. 103, and in fact I received some of those e-mails earlier today.

So I know that is a long list, let me just make sure the parties have received and reviewed all of those submissions.

MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor; the government has.

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge. 1 THE COURT: Is there anything in connection with 2 3 today's sentencing that I did not mention but I should have reviewed? 4 5 MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor. MR. BOVE: 6 No. 7 THE COURT: And aside from issues that I have already addressed, what are the parties' views as to whether the 8 9 redactions of the parties' submissions should remain in place? 10 MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, for the reasons we have set 11 forth previously, the government's position is they should 12 remain in place. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Bove? 14 MR. BOVE: We agree, Judge. Thank you. 15 THE COURT: So I have also reviewed these redactions and agreed that what remains are appropriate redactions that 16 are narrowly tailored and I will allow them to remain in place. 17 18 Mr. Folly, has the government complied with its obligations to victims under federal law? 19 20 MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor; we have. 21 THE COURT: Do you expect any victims who wish to 22 speak in court today? 23 MR. FOLLY: No victims have indicated that they intend 24 to speak today. 25 THE COURT: At the appropriate time I will confirm

whether any victims wish to be heard today. Given that we have a few overflow courtrooms, there is a possibility that a victim who wishes to speak is not in this courtroom, so any victims who may be observing or listening in to the proceeding in another courtroom and wishes to speak, I will invite you to come to courtroom 12D where we are and let one of the security officers in the courtroom know. Tell the officer your name, that you wish to be heard, and I will arrange for you to speak at the appropriate time. And also, as I mentioned earlier, I received e-mails in the defense submission from two individuals that appear to be written in French, Ms. Thomas and Jamps Maigan. If either of those individuals wish to speak they are welcome to do so. Since I am not fluent in French I do not know what they wrote in those letters.

I want to go back to Mr. Bove. As I mentioned when I ran through the materials I reviewed, one of the issues you raised was the government's failure to produce in discovery the videos of the April 28, 2022 investor meeting. Now this does seem like a relatively significant piece of evidence, or at least an important meeting that occurred given representations that were made to investors at that meeting including as to the robo-advisory assistant. As I will address shortly, my inclination is to consider Exhibit B today in arriving at Mr. Alexandre's sentence. I want to confirm that the defense does not request any adjournment to further consider or

evaluate that video or the videos.

MR. BOVE: That's right, Judge; we are not seeking an adjournment.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly, I believe I reviewed your declaration. Are you able to confirm that to the best of your knowledge the government has otherwise complied with its discovery obligations in this case?

MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor; we confirm that.

THE COURT: Now, I also mentioned when I ran through everything that I received a letter last night from the government which was submitted under seal. And I know given that it is under seal we need to be careful as to what we say about it. Mr. Bove, do you wish to be heard on whether that letter should be considered today?

MR. BOVE: We have no objection to it being considered. We do not dispute its contents and would appreciate an opportunity, at the appropriate time, to be heard at side bar in response.

THE COURT: As to one other preliminary matter, I have considered the defense's application that I strike Exhibit J of the government's submission. I will deny that application.

The information in that exhibit which comes from a lawyer seems appropriate for me to at least consider. The person, for example, claims that a victim of the defendant's scheme is now unable to pay the mortgage on her home which is in foreclosure

and expresses the view of others as to the defendant's conduct.		
Now, with that said, the weight these statements should be		
afforded is a different matter. The defense has provided		
evidence suggesting that this witness is a disbarred attorney		
who has engaged in recruiting victims of EminiFX to join in a		
class action lawsuit against the defendant which the defendant		
contends would be in violation of Judge Caproni's		
anti-litigation injunction in the CFTC civil action. So while		
I will consider Exhibit J and not strike it, I will afford it		
weight as I see appropriate in light of the information		
provided by defense and arguments I hear today.		
Let me turn to the presentence investigation report.		
Mr. Bove, have you read the presentence investigation report?		
MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge.		
THE COURT: Have you discussed it with your client?		
MR. BOVE: I have.		
THE COURT: Mr. Alexandre, have you also read the		
presentence investigation report?		
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.		
THE COURT: Have you discussed it with your attorney?		
THE DEFENDANT: Yes.		
THE COURT: Have you had enough time and opportunity		
to review the report?		
THE DEFENDANT: Yes.		
THE COURT: And discuss it with your attorney?		

25

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Have you been able to go over with 3 Mr. Bove any errors that you saw in the report? 4 THE DEFENDANT: We went over it multiple times. 5 THE COURT: Also, have you been able to have enough 6 time to discuss with Mr. Bove anything you would like him to 7 raise with me today at sentencing? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Folly, has the government also 10 reviewed the presentence investigation report? 11 MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Let's turn to the objections. Before I go 13 through particular objections that appear to remain, let me ask 14 counsel as a more global matter whether either party feels 15 there is a need for an evidentiary hearing on any of the remaining objections. 16 17 Does the government have a view? 18 MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, the government does not 19 believe an evidentiary hearing is necessary at this time. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Bove? 21 MR. BOVE: We don't think that one is necessary with 22 respect to the live issues in the PSR. There are other issues 23 today that I think are going to come up where there will be more of a discussion. 24

THE COURT: With respect to the live issues in the

PSR, one that I wanted to ask about involves this robo-assistant, this robo-advisor assistant. I wanted to get a sense of how big a disagreement there is in the parties' view as to this technology. It would seem to me that there is significant difference between a defendant who may have just completely made up the possibility and existence of this technology versus someone who had it in development but it wasn't quite ready and operational.

Is it the government's view that the entire concept of the robo-advisor assistant was made up?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, it is the government's view that the robo-assisted trading technology did not exist. We have seen no evidence during the course of the investigation that it existed in any form. The defendant seems to acknowledge that even himself, in his own letter; he says the artificial intelligence part that would take over trading functions on the Forex trading desk were "still missing."

That's the government's position.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove?

MR. BOVE: This is not a place where we want to get bogged down in semantics, Judge, but I think our point here is that Mr. Alexandre allocuted to the absence of a specific part of the technology that was advertised to be associated with these accounts. We concede that, we accept responsibility for it, he has expressed remorse for it already, and he will do

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that again today.

What we are mainly trying to protect against in the record is the suggestion just that there were no accounts or that nothing went in to them. There are other features of the accounts in EminiFX that did exist. There was briefing in the pretrial motions about the API interface which made point payments and the servers at EminiFX, so this is -- I think realistically what the record supports is this is someplace in the middle. There are sentences that say categorically there was no such account. I don't think that is accurate and I think your Honor appreciates the difference and modified the PSR to reflect it. There was plenty of things, features of these accounts that did exist and there was also -- and I think we will talk about this more based on the exhibits in the submissions -- plenty of things in progress that reflects on Eddy's intent moving forward with the accounts.

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, if I can be heard briefly in response to that?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, I'm not sure specifically what accounts or features of the accounts are being referred to but your Honor was inquiring specifically about what the defendant advertised as his, quote unquote, core product, he called it a robo-assisted advisory account, he referred to it as RA3 and, your Honor, specifically investors asked him how he was able to

earn so much money for them and his response to that question is that he had his secret technology that was enabling him to earn those returns. Your Honor, the government's position is that that technology did not exist, there was no trading technology that enabled the defendant to earn outsized returns. He falsely represented that repeatedly to investors both that he had the technology and that it was actually earning these returns.

THE COURT: So when we get to those parts of the presentence report my inclination was to have language that essentially said that robo-advisor assisted account, or RA3, was not operational or functional at the time that the representations were made to potential investors.

Mr. Bove, is there any disagreement with that characterization? Again it was not operational or functional at the time.

MR. BOVE: Judge, I think that a specific reference to the absence of the AI technology would most likely track our allocution in this case but, generally speaking, yes, we agree that's accurate.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly, what is the government's view on that characterization in the presentence report?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, can you read it back again?

THE COURT: We can do it again when we get to the specific paragraphs but I think it may come up a couple of

times but essentially would say something along the lines of, in reality, EminiFX did not have an operational or fully functioning robo-advisor assisted account at the time that the representations were made to investors.

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, the only phrase we would take issue with is the use of the phrase "fully functional" because we have no evidence that it was functional in any way, shape or form, insofar as he represented to investors that it was being used to facilitate the trading and to achieve these outsized returns. There is no evidence that that was happening.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. FOLLY: So we would request that it be not fully functional but that it was not functional; it was not in use and it was not functional.

THE COURT: Yes, don't we take it up when we get to that paragraph. I think the first objection that still remains from the defense is paragraphs 8 and 9; is that right,

Mr. Bove?

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: These paragraphs concerned the defendant's adjustment and conduct while on pretrial supervision. There are reports that there were some instances of non-compliance with home detention including some unauthorized stops in late 2022. None of these issues were reported to me by pretrial services either for me to consider as a basis for bail

modification or for bail revocation for that matter, or even just brought to my awareness. One of the points the defense makes is that the defendant was never able to challenge these accusations. Mr. Bove, my question is regardless of whether

these purported violations were brought to my attention, your response to probation says that the issues involved little more

7 than good faith misunderstanding between Mr. Alexandre,

counsel, and EDNY pretrial services. Is there anything in

paragraphs 8 and 9 that is factually incorrect or are you

concerned with how it is characterized?

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BOVE: I guess it is the latter, Judge. think any of the things referenced in these paragraphs are fairly characterized as non-compliance in the context of the supervision relationship and our main point here is that my presumption, personally from throughout the supervision period, was that pretrial services was monitoring Mr. Alexandre by GPS in real-time. There were times when we made applications to the Court to reduce restrictions on his travel including for employment, and as Eddy started on that process he started with a job, he did certain things that to my understanding, including things, Judge, like stopping for lunch while working, that to my understanding pretrial services was aware of in real-time and had no issue with. So, when they brought it -they changed the technology around December of 2022 and when they brought it to my attention that they viewed these things

as non-compliance I said that wasn't our understanding. We talked through some of the facts. To your Honor's point, I think there is — these things weren't brought to the Court's attention so that a hearing could be sought. I also wasn't in an adversarial posture with the officer at the time about these things, I didn't ask for proof or evidence and he now views it as significant problems in the PSR that are going to travel with Mr. Alexandre in this document suggesting that he is not compliant with supervision and I just don't think that is the case and I don't think that when you look at the way supervision played out that that is what happened here and that is why we are asking that these be struck.

THE COURT: Does the government have a view?

MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor. We don't have any additional information other than what has been offered in those paragraphs.

THE COURT: I will make a couple of changes to paragraphs 8 and 9. For paragraph 8 -- and I will indicate where the new language before the first and second sentence is -- it will now read: We communicated with the defendant's supervising pretrial services officer in the Eastern District of New York who related although no bail violations had been submitted to the Court, that pretrial services believes that the defendant had instances of non-compliance with regard to his home detention condition. It was reported that the -- this

is also new -- purported non-compliance began in August 2020 but became increasingly apparent in October 2022. And then, at the conclusion of paragraph 9, I will add the following language so there is no possible confusion. That language will read: Alexandre maintains that these instances of purported non-compliance were the result of good faith misunderstandings between him, his attorney, and the pretrial services officer, and some of them occurred during a period when Alexandre and the family were displaced from their rental home following a fire. None of these issues of non-compliance were brought to the Court's attention, nor did the Court make any finding of non-compliance. The Court never held a hearing at which Alexandre had the opportunity to contest them or otherwise explain any misunderstanding.

Do you want to be heard any further on that?

MR. BOVE: I would ask that we also add that

Mr. Alexandre disputes that they were in fact instances of
non-compliance.

THE COURT: I think that's fair to add.

MR. BOVE: I have not seen pretrial services behave like this, Judge, and it will necessarily impact the way the defense bar works with them going forward when you have informal conversations like this that they don't feel rise to the level of reporting to your Honor, and then you find them as a surprise in the draft PSR that they basically transcribed

their version of a conversation. It just puts everyone in a difficult position.

THE COURT: Well, I will add the sentence that Alexandre does not view these instances as non-compliant.

Now we go to paragraphs 12 and 13. These paragraphs provide an overview of the criminal scheme. Mr. Bove, it seems to me the primary objection here is to the supposed argumentative nature of these two paragraphs, and in particular language that the defendant did not invest a substantial portion of the funds. Is that accurate?

MR. BOVE: So for paragraph 12, Judge, I think there are four sentences that were at issue in our submission, the last four beginning Alexandre offered his investors... through the end of the paragraph. We withdraw our objection to the final two sentences, and in particular — it is relatively early in the proceeding — I want to be clear that Eddy has acknowledged in Exhibit A, his letter, that these ROI figures that he provided to investors were not accurate reflections of the investment performance of the funds. I think that bears a lot on this proceeding but we are not going to be disputing things that relate to that 5 to 9 percent issue in the PSR.

With respect to the remaining two sentences, the two above that, the issue is that I don't think that this PSR requires a summary paragraph, I don't think it is necessary for the probation officer to just copy the complaint in the PSR

and, in particular, in these two sentences I'm not sure where the quotation "guaranteed" is used. I'm not sure where that came from. I didn't have an opportunity to review that video and it sort of parallels the situation that happened where we got a video a little bit later. We should have an opportunity, I submit, to review the evidence that underlies these positions in the PSR and contest them or not. When it is this vague — and this is going to come up in other of our objections — it makes that impossible and so the quote "guaranteed" is a problem in that way.

I guess the next sentence also touches on this 5 percent issue that we are not contesting so it is really just that.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly, the word "guaranteed" especially in quotes, where is that coming from?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, I don't know if there is a specific quote that is being referred to. I think it is accurate to say, to use the word "guaranteed." I think it would be equally accurate to use the word "promise," we have no objection to modifying it or revising it to say that he promised high investment returns, if that would solve the dispute.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove, it does seem accurate to me.

MR. BOVE: That's fine. Thank you.

THE COURT: So that sentence will be changed to

Alexandre promised his investors high investment returns using new technology, and it will continue as written.

Are there any other remaining objections to paragraph 12 and 13?

MR. BOVE: No, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: With respect to the next possible objection, I believe it will be paragraph 15 of their -- what I had proposed earlier was that last sentence being changed to:

As noted, RA3 did not exist -- changed from: As noted, RA3 did not exist, to: As noted, RA3 was not in fact operational or functional at the time these representations were being made to potential investors, although it may be fine just to leave it as is.

Do the parties have a view on that?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, we think it is accurate as it is and that the revision that your Honor has proposed, we don't have an objection to that.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove?

MR. BOVE: We prefer the revised version.

THE COURT: I will make that revision to the last sentence.

I believe next is paragraph 19, unless there is objection before that, Mr. Bove.

MR. BOVE: 19 is next; yes, Judge.

THE COURT: I mentioned this earlier but since

paragraph 19 discusses the April 28, 2022 investor meeting in a bit of detail, I note that I will not strike the discussion of the April 18, 2022 investor meeting as the government represents in its declaration, the omission of the video clips of that meeting appear to have been inadvertent and was remedied as soon as the government became aware that it had not, those clips had not been previously produced. I also did not think that there is prejudice here to the defense for the late production given that the clip was not exculpatory, as the defense acknowledged and of course Mr. Alexandre himself was the one who made these statements who presumably would know what he said at those meetings, particularly the meeting on April 18, 2022.

So, as to the changes in this paragraph let me just first address some, because there appears to be agreement, the government agrees in the sentencing submission on page 7 and page 8 to certain changes, largely along the lines of the defendant's request. So I will add to paragraph 19 subparagraphs A through C that read as follows:

Subparagraph A: EminiFX used as many as 59 employees from the Robert Haft Staffing in March 2022 EminiFX had approximately 25 accounting employees.

Subparagraph B: Robert Xiong was one of the employees referred by Robert Haft. Xiong's résumé stated that he had (1) extensive financial modeling experience and solid quantitative

skills on credit equity derivatives structured products; and
(2) developed propriety and equity trading models to
systematically calculate intrinsic value given historical
financial data to identify investment opportunities.

And then subparagraph C: Alexandre also hired Jeffrey Perelman as VP of FX development and member education. On May 3, 2022, Perelman extended an offer to Matthew Barlow for a position as a full-time energy commodity trader beginning Monday, 5/16/22. On May 6, 2022, Perelman notified Alexandre that he planned to extend an offer to a second trader, Danny, who was a seasoned Forex trader for BVVA Bank.

Now, as to the four statements from employees the defense asked to include I will add what the defense proposes to some extent, although there are certain changes proposed by the government. I am not sure they are all directly relevant to the offense conduct but I will add them to the report nonetheless.

Subparagraph D will read, as follows: Various EminiFX employees who were interviewed by the government provided their observations as to the operations of the company including:

- (i) Employee 4 thought EminiFX seemed to be a legitimate company as they had traders, an accounting department, and human resources department.
- (ii) Employee 5 worked at EminiFX on coding models for stock valuations and forecasting stock prices.

- (iii) Employee 6 stated that as CEO of EminiFX, Alexandre had multiple traders although the government contends that Dan was the only individual at EminiFX who engaged in any trades on behalf of investors.
- (iv) Alexandre hired an employee whose purported role was to create a Forex division.

And that means then the original subparagraphs of 19 will we begin at that point starting at E. Actually, let's just say those subparagraphs I just mentioned, maybe I should start after the current E since they all pertain to the April 28, 2022 investor meeting.

Are there any other issues with respect to paragraph 19 that we need to take up?

MR. FOLLY: Not from the government, your Honor.

MR. BOVE: No, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Is there still an objection to paragraph 20, Mr. Bove? This is the one that starts with the language that the defendant made similar representations in other settings.

MR. BOVE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: And paragraph 22, is there an objection to that one still?

MR. BOVE: We maintain our objection to the "failed to invest" language, Judge. We are going to rest on our papers for that. I do think there is a difference between what the

investors thought when initially engaging EminiFX and sent money in, so like some of the exhibits attached to the government's submission referring to BitCoin transfers as deposits, that initial interaction as compared to long-term holding by any EminiFX other than BitCoin.

THE COURT: Would adding the language at the end of the phrase in (1) saying: In the manner he promised investors... address that concern? In other words, Alexandre failed to invest a substantial amount of the investor funds he received in the manner he promised investors.

MR. BOVE: Can I have one moment, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Defendant and counsel conferring)

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge. We agree with that change. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, we would still object to that change. We think the language, as written, is accurate and that it is actually a central part of the offense conduct. He received well over a hundred million dollars in these investor deposits and represented to investors that he was using AI technology that was going to invest that money, and the money sat there. He didn't invest it. These investors understood they were funding deposits the same way if somebody was transferring money into another currency, they would have the

expectation that that money would then get invested.

Cryptocurrency, it's a currency and here you can invest and have an investment strategy with respect to currencies, but here all of the surrounding facts and circumstances demonstrate that the funding of the deposits was understood by nobody at the time to be the actual investments that were supposed to get implemented by the defendant. So we think it is actually important that this remains unchanged and that it accurately reflect that the defendant let the money sit there, did not invest it, and as a result of that he lost his investors tens of millions of dollars that they will never get back.

THE COURT: Is it your view that just putting the money in Bitcoin and seeing what happened to the money would not qualify as an investment?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, under these facts and circumstances it was not an investment. Investors understood they were funding their deposits into EminiFX by sending them in the form of cryptocurrency, and here, after the defendant received those deposits, he did not implement an investment strategy, he didn't, in turn, invest them, and that's what he represented he was going to do. And it would be the equivalent if they were using fiat currency and he said instead of sending me dollars, send me pounds, and then received the pounds and then claims later because he left them in pounds that that was actually the investment and, look, you know, it either moved up

or it moved down and that was the investment itself. But nobody at the time had that understanding. That is just an argument that is being used after the fact to hide the fact that there was no actual investing going on, or at least as it says here, a substantial amount of the investor funds he received, he failed to invest them.

THE COURT: Is it your view that the money just was never -- the funds were never moved from the Bitcoin, they were converted into some other form of deposit or investment?

MR. FOLLY: That's correct, your Honor, and that is reflected in the reports that the defendant has attached as exhibits to his submission from the receiver, they reached that exact conclusion. The money essentially sat there, a substantial amount of it, and that was not an investment, it was a deposit that was made by the investors for the purpose of the defendant then investing the money and making the investors money off of it.

THE COURT: Part of your argument though, too, is that by having the money in Bitcoin the investors were subject to significant risk. They also could have — it also could have gone up. It didn't go up in the summer of 2022 but it could have gone up. Doesn't that make it an investment? Just not in the manner that he promised investors.

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, again, I think the fact and circumstances matter a lot and here there are contemporaneous

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

e-mails and other communications, internal communications at the company that demonstrate everyone's understanding that the funding through cryptocurrency was the placement of a deposit, it was not the implementation of an investment. It would be a very, very rare case where someone would hire an investment company and transfer money and that, in and of itself, would constitute the investment and then everybody would just say hands off, we will let the money sit there, and your job is done, you have now invested the money. That was the deposit. Everybody understood I am funding a deposit the same way I would send someone U.S.D. And sure, global market conditions might change in favor or against the dollar and it might change the value of that, quote unquote, investment, but nobody had the understanding that that, in and of itself, was the investment. It was the funding of deposits, the defendant promised that he was going to, in turn, use that money and invest that money, and he did.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove, how was that an investment?

MR. BOVE: First of all, Judge, I find fascinating

Mr. Alexandre's assertion that Bitcoin is the same as any other

fiat and I look forward to discussing that with some of his

other colleagues in crypto cases that seem to take a different

view.

Your proposed modification is accurate; this was an investment, it wasn't the one that Eddy advertised on the

website. The most obvious evidence in the record to demonstrate that is the fact that when we get to the discussion of actual loss in this case, it's going to be about what happened in that account. We are not talking — the comparison between a transfer from dollars to some foreign currency, that's also a type of investment because he wasn't just holding these things.

Mr. Folly just did is a characteristic throughout their advocacy, extrapolating from one or two discrete pieces of evidence to just incredibly broad generalizations. They submitted two communications that refer to a deposit out of what they say are 30,000 investors. If they read the receiver's documents they would understand that it's maybe 25. But, those details don't matter to these guys. So the idea that you take two exhibits and you stand up in court and say everyone understood this, is just not a sustainable position and your Honor's proposed modification is accurate.

THE COURT: I don't think the modification I proposed impacts the ability of the government to make the arguments it has been making and I am sure will make today so I will have the modification as I mentioned.

Paragraph 24 is the paragraph that deals with the use of investor funds that were inconsistent with representations to investors mentioning the \$4.8 million home, the foreclosure

properties, and the luxury vehicles. Let me hear more from the defense as to that objection.

MR. BOVE: I think the main objection here, Judge, is the idea that the website was the only way that Eddy communicated with investors. On the one hand there are arguments being made that Eddy communicated with them every week during Zoom meetings about certain things but then when we bring up points about meetings that happened with investors with disclosures that are mitigating, those are categorically rejected because they weren't advertised on the website. So, our main points are these things were disclosed to investors during those meetings.

THE COURT: After the fact or before they were referred to?

MR. BOVE: While they were happening. So the cars were advertised in social media while those transactions were going on and this is — we have laid out the evidence that we submit supports this. So, that's the main part of this objection. We reviewed Exhibits G and H to the government's submission and acknowledge that the Manhasset property was intended for Eddy's personal use so we are withdrawing that objection.

The last point here is that there were service fees that were disclosed to these investors and so the fact that Eddy used some of those funds to purchase some of these things

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is consistent with the service fees that he said he was charging. We fully recognize the response to that, Judge, which is that these people didn't get what they paid for. We wanted to make that point.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly?

Your Honor, we maintain it is accurate as MR. FOLLY: written in the PSR. The defendant advertised this company as being a crypto and Forex trading platform. The suggestion that he was free to, after the fact, do whatever he wanted with the money and make some sort of partial disclosures to the investors as a remedy to that is just -- it's unlawful, your Honor. That's the bottom line here. He represented he was going to do certain things with the money, and to some extent he made either contemporaneous, as in transactions were under way kind of disclosures, or completely after-the-fact disclosures, that the entire model for the company had dramatically shifted, but in this context it is not meaningful because he didn't have the right do that in the first place. The whole company was premised, from day one, on a set of lies about having a product that could be used to generate investors' specific returns. That product never existed, he was never entitled to get that money, and he was certainly not entitled to use it to spend millions of dollars on a home for him and his family, to spend enormous sums of money on luxury cars, to spend money on fancy office space. All of that money

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that got spent will never be returned to these investors.

Period. And that is why it is accurate to characterize it as a misappropriation as it is set forth in paragraph 24.

THE COURT: Were there not times when he represented to investors that the investments included real estate, besides the \$4.8 million Manhasset home?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, he did make representations during the meetings that he had ventured into the real estate space and that he was going to be flipping foreclosure properties but the fundamental problem with this, your Honor, is these investors were never sent a notice that said in 30 days the company is going to shift its investment strategy, we are now going into the real estate market, we are going to be flipping foreclosure properties. If you want to take out your money now, if you think that is too risky, go right ahead. Instead, they were notified of it as it was happening or after it had already happened and it was completely inconsistent with what he originally represented he was going to be doing with their money. So he deprived them of the choice to withdraw their money and he just misused it. He used it on things that dissipated the money. Spending money on a \$5 million home for himself and his family is a use of the money that will never come back and it deprived these investors of their money and these other purchases; cars, charity contributions, luxury office space, all of these things had nothing to do with the

investments that he promised he was giving them.

THE COURT: I'm definitely in agreement on the \$4.8 million home. What I am more focused on are the foreclosure properties and whether or not he represented that their investments would include real estate and that might include flipping these properties.

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, he did not represent that the investments were going to include real estate from the start of the scheme. During the meetings, after people had invested, he informed them that had he started using their money to invest in real estate. That's the difference.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove?

MR. BOVE: I don't want our disputes over the PSR to distract from what I think is the most important thing from the defense perspective which is remorse. But it is my job to fight to make sure this record is accurate and to hold the government accountable when they misstep. It is the government's burden in a proceeding like this to establish facts like the ones that they just argued and I don't really get to ask questions in a proceeding like this but as I was listening to Mr. Folly I had to wonder, what is the basis in the record for the sequence of the disclosures in meetings that he just described? They submitted one recorded meeting. It doesn't back what he just said and it doesn't establish that when Mr. Alexandre discussed these things on the meeting that

they did record that that was the first time. He hasn't pointed to the timing of any of these contracts to establish that position. And I would like to take this point one step further because Mr. Folly used the phrase "since day one." And when he said that and when he wrote that or something similar in his submission, I had to wonder what is the basis in the record for what was on the EminiFX website on September 1, 2021? I don't think there is anything. I think that they took some screen shots in late April and May and are telling your Honor that that's how it existed the entire time but I don't think there is any support in the record for that.

In addition to that, when they say every week

Mr. Alexandre said this and that and this and that, the

receiver has found that the representations that were made with

respect to ROI began in late October so it wasn't every week.

And this is an exercise, Judge. This is an extremely

consequential day in this man's life and it requires a little

more precision than what you are getting from the front table

here.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly, what is the evidence about the sequence of disclosure regarding the forfeiture properties.

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, first of all, defense counsel is ignoring that we actually submitted two recordings to the Court. But, putting that aside, the issue that's being presented is if it is accurate to describe in paragraph 24 that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

he used investor funds that were inconsistent with his representations to investors. That's the issue. And the descriptions that are set forward even on the recording make reference to communications to investors about his use of the funds to engage in these real estate transactions and the recordings suggest that those transactions are in the process of happening. It's pretty remarkable, your Honor, the defendant -- this is his own company, he ran the whole thing, and he is objecting to representations that are set forth in the PSR about his timing of communicating to investors. He has proffered absolutely nothing to the contrary. Zero. made no representation or proffer that there is some factual inaccuracy about the sequence and timing of these disclosures and that they actually started on a different date and he ran the company. And, your Honor, we are here at sentencing, he had every opportunity to do that, and instead he is pointing the finger at the government and saying that we are somehow not being precise in our characterization of the sequence of the facts here but there is nothing inaccurate about saying that somebody who uses investor funds to do things like purchase a home for themselves, to do things like purchase foreclosure properties, is using them in ways that are inconsistent, at a minimum, with their prior representations that they would be using the funds for a cryptocurrency and Forex trading platform and they would be using RA3 technology that would generate

outsized returns.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove, as to the luxury vehicles, what is the explanation for that? Wouldn't they be depreciating in value?

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge, they would.

THE COURT: Do they fall into the category of the \$4.8 million home where you agree that those should not have been purchased?

MR. BOVE: No, Judge. I think there is a series of vehicles — I am going to go to the vehicle part of the PSR in paragraph 86. And so, there is seven here. Number one, the BMW Eddy used personally. We acknowledge that for whatever weight that deserves in his sentencing. 2 through 6 were not used by Eddy, these were used by others at EminiFX, they were disclosed in social media posts that we did provide to the probation office in writing the PSR, and in connection with Eddy's cooperation he went to great length to go to people who possessed the vehicles and give them back so that whatever value was on them could be recovered.

THE COURT: For the first sentence of this paragraph I will slightly modify it to read: Alexandre used investor funds for purposes that were, at times, inconsistent with his representations to investors as to how he would use their funds; and keep the remainder of the paragraph. Certainly I understand the parties' arguments from both sides as to this

but that language would be fair here.

I think the last objection may be paragraph 26, if that still is an objection. Mr. Bove, is there an objection to 26?

MR. BOVE: I think it has been resolved based on your Honor's modification.

I apologize for this. In reviewing the PSR to prepare for sentencing there are a few other issues that I need to bring to the Court's attention.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. BOVE: These relate to paragraphs 28, 31, and 38. So, in paragraph 28 there is a reference to a range of between 30,000 to 40,000 investors and we would ask that that be struck and corrected, based on the receiver's report, which is Exhibit J, I think at footnote 2, that indicates it is 25,000.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, we don't have any objection to that.

THE COURT: I will change, in paragraph 28, "30,000 to 40,000" to the number "25,000."

MR. BOVE: In paragraph 31 there is a foreshadowing of an updated financial analysis from the government that I don't think we got. There is another reference to the 30,000 to 40,000 number that should be corrected. And then I think the remainder is accurate, these are representations the government

1 made.

THE COURT: So I guess I would start that paragraph:

At present, unless there was an updated analysis provided in advance of sentencing... Mr. Folly?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, I didn't hear the paragraph number.

THE COURT: Sure; 31. It starts with saying that the government intends to provide an updated financial analysis in advance of sentencing.

MR. FOLLY: Yes, I think it is appropriate to start it at present with the proposed modification as to the number of investors that has been made by defense counsel.

MR. BOVE: And then paragraph 38 has that, the range, again, of the victims.

THE COURT: I will make that change to paragraph 38 as well to reflect 25,000 victims.

So, aside from those, are there any other objections to the factual recitations in the presentence report?

Mr. Folly, anything from the government?

MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove?

MR. BOVE: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Having resolved the objections that were made and hearing no further objections, I will adopt the factual recitations set forth in the presentence investigation

report with the many changes that we have noted over the past hour. The presentence investigation report will be made part of the record in this matter and placed under seal. If an appeal is taken, counsel on appeal may have access to the sealed report without further application to me.

Let me turn to the sentencing guidelines now.

Although I am not required to follow the U.S. sentencing guidelines, I still must consider the applicable guidelines range when arriving at the sentence in this case. To do that, it is therefore necessary for me to accurately calculate the guideline sentencing range.

There was a plea agreement in this case. It appears to me that the presentence report contains the same guidelines calculation as the plea agreement; is that right, Mr. Folly?

Mr. Bove?

MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does either party have any objection to the guidelines calculation in the presentence investigation report?

MR. FOLLY: The government does not.

MR. BOVE: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly, I assume the government moves for the third acceptance point?

MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor, we do.

THE COURT: I will grant that motion pursuant to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Section 3E1.1(d).

So let me put on the record my calculation of the application of the sentencing guidelines as to Mr. Alexandre. The base offense level for Count One is six pursuant to U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Section 2B1.1(a)(2), and that is because the offense to which he has pled guilty, 26 levels are added pursuant to Section 2B1.1(b)(1)(N). That is because the loss amount was greater than \$150 million but not greater than \$250 million; two levels are added pursuant to Section 2B1.1(b)(2)(A)(i) and that is because the offense involved 10 or more victims; two levels are also added pursuant to Section 2B1.1(b) and (c), and that is because the offense involves sophisticated means and the defendant intentionally engaged in or caused the conduct that constituted these sophisticated means; four more levels are alleged because the offense involved a violation of the commodities law and at the time of the offense the defendant was a commodity pool operator; and lastly the offense level is decreased by three pursuant to Section 3E1.1 because of the defendant's timely acceptance of responsibility. The result is an offense level of 37. Because the defendant has no criminal history, he has no criminal history points, that puts him in Criminal History Category I.

Now, offense level 37 and Criminal History Category I, the resulting guidelines range would normally be 210 to 262

months' imprisonment. The maximum authorized sentence for Count One, however, is 10 years in prison, so that means the effective guidelines range in this case is 120 months in prison. And in addition, the guidelines fine range after finding an ability to pay on the part of the defendant is \$40,000 to \$1 million.

Now, I believe the plea agreement also provided that neither party would be seeking a departure from the stipulated guidelines range and of course I am referring to a departure, not what is more commonly known as a variance. I understand that the defense is going to be advocating for a variance from that range.

Is that right, Mr. Bove? Does the defendant seek a departure from the guidelines range?

MR. BOVE: We are not seeking a departure; correct.

THE COURT: What about the government?

MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I, too, have considered whether there is an appropriate basis to depart from the advisory guidelines range and while I acknowledge that I have the authority to depart, I do not find any grounds warranting an upward or downward departure in this case and I therefore will decline to depart from the guidelines range.

I will now hear from the parties as to sentencing. I propose I will hear first from the government, then I will hear

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

from Mr. Bove. I then will ask whether there is anyone, any victims who wish to be heard, and then lastly I will see if the defendant wishes to make a statement.

Does anyone have any concerns with that schedule?
MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly or Mr. Lenow? Please.

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, the scale of this fraud scheme and the damage inflicted by the defendant was enormous in this The brazen nature of his conduct, the exceptionally case. large number of victims that he defrauded, the way that he manipulated the members of his own community that trusted him. He took that trust, he turned it around, and he used it as a tool to recruit more and more victims into this fraud scheme; victims who were not institutional investors, who were not high net worth investment clients, victims who were ordinary, everyday people who put their hard-earned money in his hands for one reason, and that reason was because they trusted him and they believed the things that he said about his company, the lies that he told them about his company. In light of all of that, a quideline sentence of 120 months is fully warranted in this case.

Your Honor, starting first with the offense conduct, which we have already spent a considerable amount of time discussing here today, the first point there is the scope of this scheme and the number of lives that it touched cannot be

overstated. It was a massive scheme. It was an operation for a period of eight months and only came to an end because the defendant was arrested. But during that eight-month period of time, the defendant managed to solicit approximately 25,000 victims into his scheme, an enormous number. Approximately \$250 million in investments poured into the defendant's company. He ran that company, it was his company, he was the CEO, he was the spokesperson, it all revolved around him. And not only did he manage to dupe such a large number of victims, he also caused tremendous financial harm to those victims. It's not just that he took their money, it is that he also erased an enormous portion of their money that they will never get back because of his lies and because of his scheme.

In addition, your Honor, one of the most deeply troubling aspects of this scheme, and it is something that the defense actually points to in favor of their request for a below guideline sentence, I believe they phrased it as a substantial variance; your Honor, he exploited his position in the community. He was a trusted pillar of his community, of his church, of the Haitian community. He was a pillar. People believed him when he said he had a company and he had an investment product that was capable of transforming their lives, that was capable — and this is not a direct quote, your Honor, I am capturing the sentiment — he offered them 5 to 9.99 percent returns every week. That is a transformational

amount of money. And they believed him because they had every reason to believe him because he presented himself to that community, he was dedicated, he was known to give back to that community, he served that community. We are not here to dispute that, your Honor, but what we are here to do is carefully examine the way that he used that as a tool to get so many victims into this scheme, victims that would not have otherwise trusted him. If he had been an unknown person, if he did not have the reputation of trust and the reputation of doing good deeds in his community that he did, he would never have been able to successfully induce these victims to parting with their hard-earned money and handing it over to him. And right alongside that, he also used the church. He used the church as an instrument to recruit, to get more victims into this scheme.

So, while we recognize that his good deeds in the community are a mitigating factor, his betrayal of that trust and his deliberate use of it as a tool to get more and more investors and more and more money into this company is anything but a mitigating factor, it is a factor that counsels in favor of the 120-month sentence, the guideline sentence that should be imposed here.

In addition, your Honor, this was a scheme that was entirely deliberate and calculated from inception. Your Honor, we read the defendant's letter in this case carefully, and

although the defendant said the theme for today at sentencing is the defendant's remorse, what has been remarkable is that since the day the defendant pled guilty, he has completely failed to accept actual responsibility for his misconduct in this case.

There was never a basis to start this company. There was never a basis. The product never existed and the defendant, nevertheless, launched the company, even though from day one it was a fraud. It was entirely smoke and mirrors. He had a fancy office in midtown, he hired multiple employees, he had a website, he had a recruitment video on that website. The problem, your Honor, was he never had the product that he was telling the investors was going to earn them the money.

And your Honor, it was clear that it was calculated because the defendant acknowledges that he was faced with questions along the way. He said in that video that is referenced in the PSR that he was getting questions about how are you earning all this money for us? And he said it was this proprietary product, this RA3, this AI technology. And your Honor, it did not exist, that was a total fiction. And it was the whole premise of the company. It wasn't a lie about do we have 150 shoes on the shelf or do we have 130? Your Honor, it was a lie about the entire promise that he was making to the investors that he had this technology that could earn them these huge returns. And it never existed. He said it was a

trade secret, he said it was the core product. He kept leading investors to believe that not only did it exist but it was responsible for generating these incredible returns. He peddled that from the beginning and that shows, your Honor, his state of mind. He says today is about remorse but his actions throughout this case and throughout this scheme demonstrate he fully intended to mislead these investors.

Your Honor, another fact that is relevant to understanding the defendant's frame of mind is his actions during the scheme and some of the ways he was using the money. And there was the suggestion in the defense submission that he actually made a decision that he was going to try to fix his errors. And that is completely contradicted by the record because right during the same time in the lead-up to his arrest that he claims he was trying to fix his errors, he was using investor funds to purchase a \$5 million home for him and his family -- with investors investor funds. So the idea that he was trying to fix the company at the very same time that he was using an enormous sum of investor funds to purchase himself a \$5 million home, it is completely inconsistent with his own actions.

Your Honor, I spoke a moment ago about the scope of this scheme and not only the way that it impacted such a large number of victims but the way that it had a very profound impact on those victims, the way that it damaged and hurt their

lives. And your Honor, some of the victims' statements speak to this. On page 9 of our submission there is an excerpt from a victim statement saying: My family lost over a half a million dollars in this Ponzi scheme. Mr. Alexandre destroyed my family -- I apologize -- destroyed family, broke marriages, separated children with parents, caused people to become homeless.

Your Honor, that's what happens when a defendant like Alexandre targets everyday people and gets them to give them massive amounts of money. It completely damages their life, particularly here where there is real money that was lost and will never go back to those investors. They have been without that money for a year and they will never get that money, all of it back; they will not because of the defendant's scheme.

This is not a scheme, your Honor, that hurt a small handful of people or that hurt institutional investors or anything of the sort. It is a scheme that damaged everyday people's lives and that damage will be felt for years to come as these investors try to put their life back together and deal with the loss of the money as a result of this defendant's actions.

Your Honor, the other point, just focusing on this scheme itself, is the defendant did this himself, he did it alone, he wasn't acting at someone's direction. This all came from him. He cannot blame anyone but himself. He made every

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

decision, he made the misrepresentations. It all falls on this defendant.

Your Honor, in addition, there is a need here for general deterrence. This was a fraud that changed the defendants' lives overnight and there is the need to deter other like-minded individuals from engaging in this type of The defendant was able to get access to a lifestyle that he never would have had absent this scheme. He suddenly was the CEO overnight of a very, quote unquote, successful company with tens of thousands of investors, with millions under his management. He was able to purchase himself a \$5 million home. Your Honor, general deterrence is important here so that others do not engage in a scheme like this. also important, your Honor, because schemes like this erode the public's trust in the future for other investment opportunities. They damage that trust and a substantial sentence here is required in order to defer others from inflicting similar damage on the community.

Your Honor, specific deterrence is also particularly important here and that's not always the case in some of these white collar sentencings, but here it is particularly important. There is a few reasons for that, your Honor. First, the defendant, despite remorse being the focus of today, has just failed to accept responsibility. At his plea he tried to minimize his conduct. He described the trading functions as

not being, quote unquote, fully functional. He said he did this as part of his marketing. He refused to say he intended to mislead anyone, your Honor. And that goes to the heart of what he did here. He deliberately, he intentionally, and in a calculated fashion misled his entire community. That's what he did in this scheme. There is no other explanation for his conduct.

In his letter that he submitted he continues with this theme of minimizing his conduct and placing blame on other things besides himself. He places blame on the rapid growth of the company for what happened in this case. He acts as though he was just running a legitimate business and got in over his head. Your Honor, again, the problem with this is it is just inconsistent with what actually happened here. He wasn't just running a legitimate company and got in over his head. From the inception of the company he marketed something that never existed. He marketed his core product that never existed. He marketed returns that he never achieved. And he did that throughout the scheme, all the way until his arrest.

So the notion that other circumstances were to blame for what happened here, or the notion that he was just in over his head, or the notion that he was actually going to fix it and this was just the result of some technical failures or anything of the sort — that seems to be the suggestion throughout his letter — is completely inconsistent with his

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

actual actions with what he did from day one.

Your Honor, the other point here is the defendant's willingness to do something like this again. It is not just hypothetical the way it is in some other cases. Your Honor, the government has put forward documentation to the Court indicating that after the defendant was charged in this case, he continued to engage in conduct he knew he was prohibited from doing. He continued to meet with victim investors, to discuss additional investments, he attempted to dissipate \$100,000, a substantial sum of money, despite making representations that all of the money that he had access to was tied up in connection with the government's actions that were taken at the time of his arrest. Your Honor, that conduct, since the case was charged, also speaks to specific deterrence. It also speaks to the need for a substantial sentence, a sentence of the guidelines of 120 months.

Your Honor, there is another point relevant to the defendant's failure to accept responsibility. That failure in this case has had a corrosive impact and effect on the judicial system, on the legitimacy of these proceedings, on the public's perception of justice. Many of the investors who wrote letters of support that were attached to the defendant's submission do not believe he did anything wrong. To this day. Honor, one of the main, if not the main reason that they don't believe he did anything wrong is because he has continued to

make those representations. It's in his letter, the way he

writes his letter to the Court explaining what happened in this

case, it leaves the suggestion that this was not a fraud

scheme, that he didn't, at the inception of the company, launch

a company that didn't have the core product it was promising

his investors; it leaves the suggestion that what happened here

was a series of innocent mistakes and that is absolutely

Court.

There were statements in the letters that the defendant kept his promises, that he never lied to anyone since the launch of the platform, that he is innocent, that the government shut down the club with a lot of accusations that were not true. Your Honor, part of what is so troubling here is the defendant's willingness, up through sentencing, to attempt to continue to mislead that community that he misled during the course of this fraud scheme.

inconsistent with what is in the PSR and the facts before this

THE COURT: Let me ask you, some of those individuals who wrote, made reference to -- and I think the way you described the letters is very, very fair, Mr. Folly, I will say that, they almost all express frustration that this came to an end because every Friday they were getting their 5 percent.

Were they actually pulling out 5 percent on every Friday or was it a notification that your account went up 5 percent?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, on Fridays they had the choice

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

as to whether they would withdraw or reinvest, and your Honor, that goes to one of the core misrepresentations that the defendant was making to these victims. It was the false representation that that money actually existed as to all of these investors, that if they all chose to withdraw all of their money, including the profit that he falsely represented they had made, they could do so. They never could. had done that, there would have been far more money requested to be withdrawn than existed. That was the core of this scheme, it was a scheme that was operating in many ways as a Ponzi scheme. It required the in-flow of new money in order to satisfy whatever withdrawal requests came in because the company was not earning legitimate investment returns and certainly was coming nowhere close to the representations that were made to the investors. And your Honor, that is detailed in the attachment that the defendant attaches the report from the receiver. It lays it out, week by week, the total discrepancy between the representations made to investors about their ROI and about what actually existed for those investors were they to choose to withdraw their money.

So, your Honor, those investors believed that they had that money but it was a total fiction, it never existed, that money never existed. And your Honor, the defendant, the way that he has presented himself in his letter to the Court, at his plea allocution, it continues to mislead investors about

the true scope of his conduct and what he really did to the community that supported him and still supports him.

Your Honor, the other point relevant to specific deterrence, this defendant is smart, this defendant has a community of supporters, this defendant has a supportive family, this defendant has shown over time that he is capable of earning a lawful living. And while all of that is again pointed to as mitigation, despite all of that, the defendant engaged in this massive fraud scheme. He was blinded by his own ambition. He continues to distort reality, that is clear in his submission. And he will continue to put people in harm's way as he has done even since the case has been charged.

So, your Honor, while he points to his personal background, he points to his character all as being a basis for a substantial variance, those factors cut both ways in this case. He had opportunities many defendants don't. He was not desperate. There is no suggestion that this was a crime committed out of desperation. What is clear is it was a crime committed because of his own ambition. He wanted what comes with the success, he wanted to be the CEO of a big company. And he has shown that he is willing to lie at every turn to get and achieve that.

Your Honor, the last point, there was some argument regarding unwarranted sentencing disparities. Your Honor, we have cited two cases with fair resemblance to this case in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which case the defendants received substantially similar In addition to that, your Honor, the bigger point sentences. here is this defendant's crime was not average. It wasn't an average crime. So the comparison to other crimes that had similar Criminal History Category or were in Zone Z of the sentencing table, as cited in the defendant's submission, is not appropriate here. This was a crime where the defendant abused his position of trust in the community, he perpetrated an egregious fraud that harmed 25,000 victims, that defrauded them of \$250 million, that caused economic harm of at least \$50 million that will never be returned to those investors. So while we agree the loss amount should not be the sole driver in any way of this sentence, the sentence sought by the government of 120 months is not solely based on the loss amount, it is based on all of the various factors that I have addressed during the course of this sentencing.

Your Honor, nothing less than 10 years is just punishment for what the defendant has done. Nothing less than 10 years is sufficient to deter others from get-rich schemes just like this. Nothing less than 10 years is sufficient to deter this defendant from engaging in future crimes. This defendant, who despite his guilty plea, has failed to accept responsibility in a meaningful way for his crimes and for the enormous damage that he has inflicted on his community. Your Honor, in light of that, there is no basis for the substantial

variance requested by the defendant and every basis for a guideline sentence of 10 years.

THE COURT: So, if Count One didn't have a max of 10 years the guidelines would be far higher than that. Count Two had a max of 20 years. What should I take from the fact that the plea was to only Count One here?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, in negotiating this plea the government did take into account some of the mitigation that is set forth in the defendant's sentencing submission. Among that mitigation is the fact that the defendant will likely be removed, although I would note he has chosen not to consent to his removal and sign the consent to his removal. And your Honor, he would be facing a far more significant sentencing exposure had the government not offered him that lower cap of 10 years in this case. Your Honor, the government has already factored in to its plea offer the very things that the defendant is now citing in his request for a substantial variance below that 10-year cap.

THE COURT: And presumably that will include accepting responsibility.

MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Where are things with restitution?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, as to restitution, we spoke briefly with defense counsel before today's proceeding. Our request would be that the Court today impose restitution in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

amount of \$213,639,133.53, which is the maximum amount that is set forth in the parties' plea agreement, with the understanding that the parties will come back to the Court within 90 days with a proposed restitution order for the Court at that time that includes the table of victims and can take into full consideration discussions with defense counsel as well as the receiver on whether that number should be modified to a different amount.

THE COURT: I will hear, of course, from Mr. Bove, but is it your understanding that the defense agrees with that amount, with what you just proposed?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, that is my understanding. only discussed it very briefly so Mr. Bove may have further comments on that.

Your Honor, on forfeiture, we would note that the Court entered the consent preliminary order of forfeiture at the time of the plea and we would of course request that that be ordered in connection with sentencing.

THE COURT: Obviously the point that you made regarding conduct following his arrest, aside from that, do you have any reason to dispute the claims that Mr. Alexandre otherwise has been cooperative with the receiver?

> No, your Honor. MR. FOLLY:

THE COURT: OK. Thank you very much, Mr. Folly.

Mr. Bove?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.

We are here today because Eddy accepted responsibility for this. He accepted it at his quilty plea, he accepted it in a way that probation credited it, he accepted it in his letter to the Court, and you will hear from him directly later on. seems to be the government's position that if Eddy doesn't want to use the words they use, if he wants to exercise rights like objecting to facts in the PSR, or requiring the government to establish a basis for his removal, that somehow that reflects something less than a complete acceptance of responsibility or it amounts to a failure to express sufficient remorse. And that is just not right, Judge, and it is just not right in a case where the man has pleaded quilty in a setting that is going to separate him from his family for the rest of his life. And to the extent it is being suggested that there is a difference between what Eddy said at his plea allocution and what he is saying at sentencing in terms of acceptance, I agree. He went one step further and he acknowledges that the ROI figures were not accurate. I think that both of those things together are the core of this offense, that is why we are here, we acknowledge that, and that there is no dispute from us about how gravely serious that offense is, about how it has impacted the victims, about what's been said by those folks that may be relevant to your Honor's consideration. No dispute from us on that. We have endeavored to provide some context to

talk about facts to provide you with evidence about what happened during these eight months so that you have a clear picture because it is simply not right that this looked on day one, in September of 2021, like it looked on May 12 of 2022. And we are not blaming anybody. Eddy said at his plea, I, alone, am responsible for this. But the context matters and that's why we put it before you and I would like to walk through a little bit of that and address any questions you have about what was going on at EminiFX and what I think it shows about Eddy's intent.

Eddy started this company in September of 2021. They didn't have a fancy office space at the time. To the extent the prosecutors just suggested otherwise that is false. The same thing, I will repeat a point I made earlier about evidence of the website. It wasn't how this started out. The way this started out was ambition, like Mr. Folly said, I agree, but it was ambition that was not matched by sufficient experience in this industry and technical capabilities to bring forward the vision that Eddy had for EminiFX. And that's not to minimize the fact that he said there was going to be AI trading and automated trading and there was not. We have conceded that. Whether we call it RA3 or not I don't think that is material. We accept responsibility for that. But what happened in late 2021 was that few members joined and the price of Bitcoin skyrocketed, up until September, and it made Eddy, in addition

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to the ambition, overly confident about his ability to deliver on these things to the folks he was talking to at the time. And I know your Honor has reviewed our submission and you can see the way that the investor count changed over time, that the receivers has described it as I think the vast, vast majority of funds that came in the door happened in the last known weeks of the company. Early on it was slow and he was wrong. wrong throughout and he was wrong at the time about what he was doing, but he thought that he could do better and as he tried to get the company set up, as best he could with the limited understanding that he had, things didn't fall into place for him and part of that is the Bitcoin price decrease that your Honor described, Eddy had trouble at banks because he wasn't familiar with the commercial expectations of banks for accounts like this for investor funds so funds got restrained and jammed up from time to time and that happened beginning in December of 2021.

Then, in March of the following year, 2022, is where you see the spike in investors. And look, I have brought to the Court's attention that we think the number based on the receiver's report is 25,000 investors. That is an extraordinarily large number and I'm not suggesting otherwise. But I think it is also important to keep in mind the structure of the way this was set up. Eddy didn't directly solicit 25,000 people, there was a multi-level marketing structure in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

place that led this thing to explode in a way that maybe he understood would happen but not at the level that it happened. While that was going on, Eddy transferred funds to interactive brokers, and your Honor referenced already today the evidence that was provided about his communications with the CFTC. my point here is his mindset was that he was trying to get these things set up. We are not saying he is not guilty. This isn't a failure to accept responsibility. But you can see steps beginning in March that show that the intention was to get this going. We appreciate that your Honor has added to the PSR the facts about what staffing at EminiFX looked like and the timing of that. As of March there were 60 employees at that office, 25 of them involved in accounting. We have talked about Mr. Perelman and Mr. Xiong who were there to help Eddy set up the trading that he had advertised. He was too little too late. But what Eddy said at his quilty plea, that it was his intention to earn people's money back and get them their money back, it was, and that's what he was doing in March and April and May.

One thing that we haven't talked about today but we mentioned in the sentencing submission is the establishment of a StoneX account which is described in Exhibits F and G, and that's another step he took, albeit too late, to get automated trading in place, relying on true experts, Mr. Xiong and Mr. Perelman, to deliver what he had been advertising for those

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

eight months. This was wrong. We are not suggesting otherwise. You will hear from them on that point. But the reason that we are bringing these things to your attention, your Honor, is that this was a situation that -- it blew up. He wasn't ready for it, he wasn't ready for what was going to happen. He wasn't qualified to handle the different features of this that needed to be put in place. And because of the role that he had played in his community, which I understand cuts both ways, because of that role he wasn't comfortable telling people the truth. That's another extraordinary failure in this case that he is sorry for and he is going to tell you that. But it wasn't greed. He did buy some things. happened in late April and early May as these transitions were put in place as he really thought things were trending in the direction that he wanted them to be, but this was a crime that was motivated -- I agree with what Mr. Folly said -- by ambition and then really perpetrated in a period where he just didn't have the tools to get it done right and he wasn't strong enough to tell people that he had this problem. And that, to me, your Honor, is what this crime is really about. And it is not a lack of acceptance of responsibility. We have acknowledged, the AI wasn't there. But he was taking steps to make this right and I think that is relevant when you think about risk of recidivism, specific deterrence, and some of the other points that the prosecutors made.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In terms of general deterrence here and what is necessary to send a message, Judge, we all understand the general point that 3553 directs sentences to factor in general deterrence and to have this messaging feature but there is not a particular number of months or years that need to be put on the sentence in this case under these circumstances where we are breaking up a family and he is going to live in Haiti after he is done completing it. The message and the signaling here was accomplished on the day he pled. And to the extent Eddy didn't sign a judicial order of removal, Judge, that was proposed to him last week within a day of the first discovery violation the government disclosed to us. We hardly had time to even consider it given the litigation that followed and all the submissions that you described. So, I really hope that that is not something that is going to be held against him when he was offered these documents at a very difficult time in his life with a lot going on.

There were some other things said about specific deterrence, Judge, that are focused on post-charge conduct and I want to be clear about what we are accepting responsibility for and what we contest.

So, as I said, last night's submission, that happened.

I think the intention behind that was to support someone that

Eddy knew he was not going to have an opportunity to support

going forward. That doesn't make it right, far from it, but we

think about the parties that were involved there. There was a person involved in that situation who hadn't been fully supported and that was Eddy's intent.

With respect to the idea that the government has established a basis for the Court to find that Eddy solicited investments after the charge in this case, we dispute that. If the Court or the government feels that that is a material and necessary to impose sentence today, we request a hearing, and in particular on, I am referring to the full contents of Exhibit N.

We have your Honor's ruling on Exhibit J but those two exhibits and the people that submitted them are related. I'm not here to attack anyone but this is another place where context matters and there is a group within the victims who decided to express their reaction to this by attacking Eddy through falsehoods, and so because of that we have accepted responsibility for the things that are true. And I understand how grave a situation it is to stand up and say that we accept responsibility with the submission last night and so I hope it is coming across how seriously we take objection to these others.

I think the government is also relying on Exhibit O to support the claim that Eddy solicited investments after the charge in this case. I don't think that that summary, one-page summary of a, I think it is at least 50 minutes of a recording,

establishes that at all. It doesn't establish who the parties are. I don't think there are references to investments. There is references to support and I think that what Eddy was talking about at that time was support in connection with this process because he had accepted responsibility publicly in February and he was moving forward and he was talking to people who had supported him emotionally before that plea and whether that would continue after, but I submit that exhibit doesn't carry the weight that the government has attributed to it. They haven't identified who is talking, there is not a discussion mention of investments.

So, for those exhibits, N, O, and J, we dispute those facts to the extent they are layered in hearsay which is indicative of the motives that drove these people to report those things. I think a careful reading of J and O indicate there is very little firsthand reporting in those letters, particularly Exhibit N.

Having said all of that about what we dispute in the record, with what is about to happen to Eddy, what more could possibly be done to specifically deter him? He is going to be removed from the country. You can consider what is happening in the CFTC proceedings and what will ultimately happen in those. He will be financially in ruins and owe these people money, as he should, for the rest of his life. There are obviously a lot of people in this world who believe that there

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are many redeeming qualities that Eddy has, people who look back on the life he has lived so far and thinks that there is an opportunity here for redemption and people that know him today and believe that this is the beginning of a second act. That's why Eddy's wife is here, his sister, his oldest son, and many, many others. And I put myself in that group that believes that this is a man who will contribute to society in a very beneficial way going forward. And that's not me or any of these other people guessing, that's based on the record including 500 letters that we put in front of your Honor describing his history. I hesitate to put a descriptor on the challenges he faced growing up in Haiti; the poverty, the violence, how he emerged as a leader to take care of his siblings, take care of people around him, what that taught him. That violence followed him into the United States. When he was here and his cousin was murdered in Haiti, he had to bring back his remains and lead the family in a funeral for that event. Eddy has showed his continued commitment to his church, his faith, his community by supporting these people throughout the pandemic. Even before that you have letters from his pastor and other people who have watched -- I recognize the point that your Honor characterizes fair about some of these letters. there are 500 letters and some of them certainly hit the themes that have been discussed already but others are very specific and very detailed about the positive contributions that Eddy

has made to society and that will continue while he is incarcerated and when he gets out.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I do want to touch a little bit on the collateral consequences of this because there is at least one that certainly was not factored in by the government in plea negotiations and I think collectively there is not very many cases like this where a defendant with this type of conduct faces removal, and so with the comparators we provided, there is just not many non-citizen cases to abide by or to look at.

When I talked about reputational consequences in our sentencing submission, what I was referring to was I think what we generally regard as a branding of someone is going to be a felon for the rest of their life and be known in that way and there is public reporting about it and I have cited a case that quotes that effect. What we learned last night and I think what your Honor learned is that the reputational impact of Eddy's conviction is much more serious than that and that there were safety concerns with him relating coming into the sentencing, and that's today, let alone what is going to happen going forward in his life when he is removed to Haiti with violent, pre-existing violence, and this will follow him for the remainder of his time. The rest of the things we talked about are very significant, Judge, and I think they take up space on paper and it takes time for me to walk through them in a courtroom. It is really, really hard to give full

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

consideration to the idea that it is possible that even today Eddy might not be at home with his wife and kids again. likely, it is inevitable, that I think Eddy will be removed from the country at the end of this sentence at a place where his family can't in any real way visit him, certainly not for long periods of time. And it is not every case where you have a record like you do here of the closeness of these family relationships and what is being broken up as a result of Eddy's That's a consequence of his decision, we get it, it is crime. a feature of the system, we get that too, but these are -- this is a close family, Judge. And I understand that what was submitted last night shed some light on a rough time in Eddy's life and in that relationship I am talking about. For sure. We are not here to suggest that he is perfect. But what came out of that was very strong because you have read the letters from the family directly. It is real what happened but this family will never be the same as a result of that.

The last thing I want to touch on is the cooperation with the receiver. There are steps here that Eddy took to facilitate this to make this case different than others that we have cited and make him more deserving of leniency than many of the other situations that I looked at. We lay them out and there is the vehicles, there is cancelling the real estate contracts. He wasn't obligated to do any of this. Many people in these situations fight. And you know Mr. Folly went to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

great lengths to talk about the corrosive nature and result of the way Eddy approached this case on the judicial system. Eddy did was facilitate what the receiver was doing with one exception that I acknowledge, but overall, this is somebody who cooperated with him and facilitated the receiver's efforts to recover money so that we are in a situation where, yes, there is a large number, over \$200 million that EminiFX took in and there is about \$170 million of assets that's been recovered so far. And I think to me the most notable is the Bitcoin payments account. The government did not know about this account when this case kicked off. We laid out the things that they said early in the case in our submission and haven't suggested otherwise. At that time the government's deposition was that Eddy had all of this money abroad and he was a tremendous flight risk and he might leave. What Eddy in fact did was tell me about the account so that we could get in touch with Coinbase and start taking payments and start to take steps to get that money back here, a hundred million dollars. acknowledging that the account was his and he controlled it, he waived his Fifth Amendment right and he helped confer a benefit that the government was not in a position to get itself with the same level of speed by signing those consents and making direct requests that Bitcoin payments and Forex to get these funds back.

So when you look, Judge, at the whole record here, his

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

upbringing in Haiti, the way he overcame challenges there, what he did before this crime, the fact that it was an eight-month very serious mistake, but eight months. The collateral consequences that he faces and the steps that he took to support what the receiver has done to help the members, we do think that the parsimony clause requires a variance in this I think that's consistent with the cases we have cited. Some of them involve sentencing and those are cases with large loss amounts. If the Court looks at what I consider to be the actual loss amount in this case, which is about \$49 million, the Bitcoin payments -- the Bitcoin losses and the coin payments account plus the operational expenses of EminiFX, the quidelines, I believe, come down to about 135 to 168, which is a range that starts to resemble the 121 to 157 in Rojas and is a little bit higher than the 87 to 108-month range in Levin. Those are cases that both involved at least quidelines loss amounts in the three digits, hundreds of millions of dollars. Rojas involved a crime that lasted years as opposed to Eddy's eight months, and there was a finding in that case that he violated -- I think it was Judge Crotty's freeze order. is a basis now for a similar finding with respect to last night's submission, I understand that, but I still submit that the value of what is discussed in that submission is dramatically outweighed by over a hundred million dollars of recovery that Eddy facilitated.

I also think that the Abarbanel case and the sentencing by Judge Kaplan is another relevant comparator.

This is a case where the government, instead of extending the 10-year cap, extended a five-year cap to a violation of Section 371. That crime, based on the record that I was able to pick up from the docket, lasted for 2.5 years. There was a \$106 million guidelines loss but he was only held accountable for the actual loss, so there I think it was about \$21 million which is — that one I argue about the \$49 million, that's the type of analogy that I am making, and there the government took a similar position, we want the statutory maximum because we have extended leniency and that leniency is the extent of what is appropriate, and Judge Kaplan still imposed a 48-month sentence.

I looked at Jaramillo and Cosme the two cases that the government cited. My sense of the record from Jaramillo is that he stole a lot of money, it was about \$1.2 million, and it was all taken. That's not what happened here. We concede and accept responsibility for the car, the Manhasset property. There are things that Eddy spent on himself towards the end of this crime. I think it amounts to — it is certainly under a million, I think it is a little bit, \$500,000 or \$600,000.

Jaramillo took all the money and Judge Swain said this at his sentencing: I do not find him to be sincere except insofar as I believe he is truly sorry that he had been caught.

N/15ale

Eddy is going to talk to you in a minute, Judge, and you will decide for yourself about whether the gravity of that statement by Judge Swain applies here. I don't think it will. I think you can already see the sincerity at his plea in the way that probation described and the way that you he interacted with them and that will continue and that is why the 144-month sentence in Jaramillo is not appropriate, it doesn't suggest that maximum, the statutory maximum sentence is appropriate here, and it is just not an accurate comparison.

Cosme, in front of Judge Preska, involved a guidelines range of 111 to 132 months. That was a combination of a fraud charge plus a 1028A mandatory consecutive 24 months and so there was a man min built into that sentence. Cosme committed perjury at trial. It is all over the sentencing transcript that the government cited to you. And so, the idea that because Eddy didn't use the words that the government would have preferred in pleading guilty as being some kind of corrosive effect on this process as compared to somebody — they cite to you a case where somebody committed perjury at a trial, it illustrates how far afield that that case is from where we are today. And so, the 111-month sentence there doesn't support what the government is asking for here.

So what we are asking for, Judge, is leniency, leniency that acknowledges the life Eddy lived before this crime started, the family that he raised, the supporters that

he has whether you think that is 500 or it is 250, it is an extraordinarily high number for a defendant coming forward in a court to be sentenced here, as further reflected by the fact that — nobody has said to me what the overflow courtroom situation is today but I know there is at least one because I watched people get turned away at the front door. And these are people who have had the opportunity to read everything that's been filed, to hear the government's allegations, and I don't think they're here, Judge, to blindly support Eddy no matter what. I think the people in this room, especially his family and friends, are here because they see some virtue in him and a chance for redemption and they want to be together as they get that started today, whatever is going to happen.

We know part of what the going to happen is extraordinarily severe no matter what sentence you impose. We have set out some options that are alternatives to incarceration followed by Judge McMahon, Judge Garaufis, I think Judge Rakoff, that I think — I hope I am sure you would consider it. And they struck me, Judge, because there are cases I have been involved in when somebody was going to be removed supervised release, it was treated as academic, it was treated as the idea that a Court should maintain jurisdiction over somebody long enough to have some supervision while they got put into ICE custody. What we are asking for a more thoughtful approach to supervised release that is, has a

punitive component because it has some restrictions on his liberty. It puts Eddy in a position to interact with the community in Haiti and to start giving back and it would allow him, I think, a more — a sentence that is more consistent with the full record of his life as opposed to what we agreed is a very serious set of records, lapses in judgments, and criminal conduct during the eight-month period at issue.

And so, for all of those reasons, Judge, we are asking for a significant variance. We leave it to your discretion in its entirety. I'm not going to name a number, but I don't think that based upon this record with the collateral consequences, the cooperation with the receiver, and what you have seen in terms of his whole life's work and people who still believe in him, that 10 years is necessary.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bove.

Before I hear from Mr. Alexandre, if he still wishes to speak, I will ask now, are there any victims of the offense who wish to be heard? I think two gentlemen in the back. How about the gentleman in the pink shirt come up first. You may go to the podium and I will ask you, sir, to identify yourself and then speak into the microphone and speak as clearly and slowly as you can since we have a court reporter here.

MR. GUILLIAUME: My name is Binson Guilliaume. I am a victim of Eddy Alexandre.

THE COURT: Before you tell us more, can you give us

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the spelling of your name, please?

MR. GUILLIAUME: My name is B-I-N-S-O-N G-U-I-L-I-A-U-M-E.

THE COURT: Binson Guilliaume. Thank you.

MR. GUILLIAUME: I am a victim of Eddy Alexandre.

THE COURT: I apologize, but just go a little bit slower so we are sure to understand and capture everything you have to say to us.

MR. GUILLIAUME: I am a victim of Eddy Alexandre. am a truck driver, your Honor. That man took my money by the greed, he had promised to be -- make me a millionaire. I take money, all my life savings to invest, by his promise, to get me money. So, I lost \$100,000 of my life saving, I have evidence to show it. Some people right here, your Honor, because of what Eddy Alexandre did to the poor Haitian community some of them -- I used to be sleep in my truck five days away, two days home. Until last month your Honor Mr. Eddy Alexandre, that man right there, his party was paid with my own money. Until now, if you go less than 10 years, that man is nearly 50, he might be going out doing the same thing over again. You can look how many people support him right here. They wait for Eddy came outside to do the same thing over again. None of them may not be investor or victim by Eddy, he paid some of them to come right here.

Your Honor, I am really frustrated. I am a poor man.

I left my country. Eddy is coming from one of the biggest school in Haiti. He was a well-educated man. At 14 I came right here. If I was Eddy I would be a doctor or lawyer, something. He is fortunate, he went to one of the best school in Haiti by the Seventh-Day Adventist. He got all the opportunity. That is what you did to the community.

I want you to stand up, Mr. Eddy Alexandre, to tell all the people you sorry, because you lied to them. Look at them right now, show us what you did and to the government the community.

Your Honor, based upon what Mr. Eddy did to me, I recommend the best, the high amount, the maximum the law will command for that man. If you give him less than 10 years he might come out there doing the same thing over and over again.

I got all the evidence right here, not no one paying me to come right here because, you know, I am opponent. I have to work hard to try to face all my needs, all my bills. That means for the victim is it greed? It is a manipulation. He is it sill going to be doing that because, you know, based off what Eddy did to the community we never get back.

Thank you, your Honor, for the opportunity.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Guilliaume.

I believe there was also a gentleman in a suit who would like to speak as well; is that right?

MR. BAPTISE: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You may come up as well, and also again, please, identify yourself and please speak as slowly and clearly as you can so we are able to capture in the transcript anything you have to say to us.

MR. BAPTISE: Good evening. My name is Phucien Baptiste.

THE COURT: Can you spell your name for us?

MR. BAPTISE: P-H-U-C-I-E-N B-A-P-T-I-S-T-E, like John

the Baptist, with E at the end.

Your Honor, I am here on behalf of all the victims who are scared because some of them have been receiving threats if they were to come to the court, something could happen to them in the future. And I heard it, I have a witness. But me, personally, as a victim, I worked hard, I suffered. When I came here as a former police inspector from Haiti, I had to leave Haiti because I was arresting some corrupt politicians, gang members, to put them in jails. There are lawyers in Haiti who would come and offer me money to free them. I will arrest those people who come and try to bribe me. When I came here, because my family didn't want me to stay in Haiti anymore because they were scared that I might have got killed because of the corruption running in this country. So I came here. worked in McDonald's mopping the floor to start. I made my way to the school. I became a nurse after so many years of trying. I failed nursing school because I was working full-time and

going to school full-time to try to make a living. After I failed nursing school, I went back again which I ended with my nursing degree.

I invested in this Ponzi scheme that Mr. Eddy
Alexandre presented to the Haitian community. Every Thursday
night he would hold the meeting to offer high interest and at
the moment Bitcoin, the cryptocurrencies were getting high,
people wanted to invest their money. Mr. Eddy Alexandre took
this advantage, this opportunity to rob the Haitian community
of their life savings, people like Binson Guilliaume who worked
27 years as a truck driver. His life savings, he showed me
close to \$100,000 of his life savings that Mr. Eddy Alexandre
robbed.

Mr. Alexandre never took responsibility for his crime and I do think the court system, the justice system, the prosecutors, it is well like they had spoke to me but none of them knew me, and everything they said is true and if the law is supposed to be priority, if we, as the justice employees, we are to keep this society safe from criminals like Eddy Alexandre never to have an opportunity to come back and hurt this society, I request that the law be applied in its full, full strength. Remember, the prosecutor has mentioned that Mr. Alexandre has lied. Yes, he has, so many times with his accomplices. He lied to the Court by saying he was acting alone. There was no way Mr. Alexandre could have acted alone.

He had accomplices like his sister, who is right here, who 1 2 would be in the meeting every Thursday night to present him. 3 Her husband is a lawyer. You mean to tell me your husband never told you that a Ponzi scheme is illegal in a society 4 that, as a wife of a lawyer, you should not be part of it and 5 6 you are presenting your brother every Thursday night to the 7 community? And we have people like Jeffrey, who was doing the stock trading and another guy name Bertrand Louis a/k/a Bert 8 9 They all knew it was a Ponzi scheme. We have another 10 prominent pastor by the name of John Maisonet. Those guys used 11 their influence in the community to rob poor-minded, innocent 12 people of their life savings. That's one lie that 13 Mr. Alexandre give by saying that he was acting alone. And I'm 14 here to ask the prosecutors why these accomplices were not 15 arrested and be put behind bars too? Because if they knew that it was a Ponzi scheme, they were in the inner circle of the 16 17 club, why are they out there? They are out there again and they're going to do the same thing to hurt this society, and as 18 19 members of the justice system we represent the state, we should 20 step up to keep the society safe, to keep peaceful citizens 21 safe, when they work 25, 30 years, \$9, \$10 an hour, they hardly 22 had an education but they managed to save while they have 23 family in Haiti, they are taking out of that \$9 an hour, \$10 an 24 Some of them save \$10,000, \$15,000, \$20,000 and now you

rob them? Do you have a heart, Mr. Alexandre?

25

Yesterday I had an interview with a guy who knew Mr. Alexandre from his church in Queens by the name of Beraca Seventh-Day Adventist Church. I have the whole interview recorded with this guy of what Mr. Alexandre used to do at that church. OK? And now again, prosecutors, why that arrest was so precipitated that the accomplices were not part of this arrest.

Another lie that Mr. Alexandre give, he broke the plea deal that he had accepted, and if that plea deal was broken why the justice system has to honor it when Mr. Alexandre himself broke it after his release from jail, your Honor? He went and try again to start a new Ponzi scheme. I have three witnesses. I have three of them and they are scared. Two of them can come here but they were afraid if they come something would happen to them. One of them was his supporters. His name is Ricardo. OK? After Ricardo followed him, your Honor, after Ricardo followed him he opened that new Ponzi scheme again while the process was going on. Ricardo told me that he invested \$100. Mr. Alexandre called Ricardo and said why are you only invested \$100.—

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you, please, to focus on how you were a victim of the crime.

MR. BAPTISE: Yes, your Honor. OK.

I invested \$25,000. I would speak to Mr. Alexandre's employees, one of them was Sophia, the wife of Pastor John

Maisonet. She would tell me what to do and she would tell me to not to invite people that I don't know. Why? If it is a legal business anybody can come in and invest. OK? So the reason why they were saying that, it is because they don't want people to come and report them. OK? Now, when Mr. Alexandre took my \$25,000, this was money that I was planning to put down on a house. I have been in this country for about 20 years. After all these hard life, hard working, honest-working, I save to fulfill my American dream, Mr. Alexandre robbed me from fulfilling my American dream and this is why I am here tonight, to request that the Court does not honor the plea deal that was made between Alexandre and the Court for the maximum 10 years because he broke it so I request that the full prescription of law be applied from 25 to 37 years.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Baptiste. I did not see anyone else, any other victims wishing to speak. I will ask again. So hearing no one else, Mr. Bove, does your client still wish to speak?

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Alexandre?

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Oh. Hold on a second, Mr. Alexandre.

(Court and deputy confer)

THE COURT: I am told that there are more victims who

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

now wish to speak before Mr. Alexandre speaks and I will hear from them. I ask the first victim to come in.

MR. L'ROVENTURE: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. L'ROVENTURE: Good afternoon. My name is Dimy L'Roventure. D-I-M-Y, last name is L-'-R-O-V-E-N-T-U-R-E.

Thank you, your Honor, for giving me the privilege to stand up here. I want to say thank you to Mr. Alexandre. reason I would like to say thank you to Mr. Alexandre, it creates something, a dream, but sometime in life dreams is not I understand Mr. Alexandre started business where he made, you know, things happen. He lost some money. And let's say the word is hard to come out but he was not strong enough to come out to tell the people he was losing but he got the courage to try to hire people. He got the courage to try to fix the problem but he did not have enough time. into business, I start in March 27, 2022. When I see what happened, I couldn't be against him but I want to see more. As the thing goes, I see a man that want to help his people. As the day goes by, people was telling me how this man for the COVID-19 would go out there helping people, people that he doesn't know, people who need help. Now I believe what I heard from other people, he end up catching the COVID-19 by helping people. I am an investor like everybody. I know this quy lost, I feel sorry for them. I lost too, but can I blame him?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I was thinking -- I was taking a chance on something, in a I pray to God every day for that dream to accomplish. dream. Why do I have to pray to God if that dream was quaranteed? is because I know everything is not quaranteed. It is a chance, you have to take it. This man risked his life, he is taking blame. People threaten him. Those two gentlemen right here, I understand they are victim but while you are a victim you can't threaten this guy life. You cannot. You see all those people here? Look at them. Can they threaten people? There is a lot of old people. Look at them. Can they threaten those people, them right here? No. People that are against Alexandre because they in the lawsuit, you see I speak today, I'm going to be in that lawsuit to. They are going to put me in there because I stand for him. That's what they're going to The man that started this lawsuit, why didn't this gentleman come forward before that? Why everybody stay away when they needed witnesses? Why? Because there was no The lawsuit guarantee money if Eddy Alexandre get 20 lawsuit. or more. That's why the lawsuit guaranteed. That's why they are going to see a lot of people walk away, because there is a lawsuit out there, they tried to take those money. After they talk to, they say, oh, there is money, I'm going to go get that money but you have to make sure this guy go away. money turned those people against each other. All those people, all those ladies from Canada, from Florida, from

California, you know he never threatened those guys.

Your Honor, I know you are doing your job but do it from your heart, not what those people say. This man is a man that is trying to help, a good thing that turned bad. That's exactly what it is. I'm not a victim. I'm a man that tried to take a chance on a dream and I know God have that dream for all of us but please, your Honor, follow your heart. Please. That's what I have to say. Thank you for the time.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Let me just advise the parties, we are now at 4:42. We are going to end this proceeding by 5:00 so we are going to need to resume it on another day, probably tomorrow. I will hear from more people who wish to speak today. Maybe,

Mr. Alexandre, if we get there, but given how long we have gone, I just want to give everyone a heads up about that.

Also, maybe I should ask right now, Mr. Bove and Mr. Folly, about schedule for tomorrow. I am on trial at the moment, it is a bench trial so I have some more flexibility in terms of scheduling, but would resuming tomorrow at 4:00, for example, be possible for everyone?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, that is fine for the government. I just -- I understand that there were some very specific travel arrangements that were made for people to be here. If there is any way to go longer, I would request that we do.

THE COURT: I was told there are no more people who wished to speak and then now it looks like there are a number more. I don't know if the answer to that is no. Frankly, we are not going to go into the evening after going for three hours already. So I will hear as many as we can, but then we are going to have to resume. The other option would be starting early tomorrow morning as well. That might be possible with travel arrangements as well.

Would 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning be possible? That might be a little bit better? I am talking to the attorneys.

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, I think the government can make that work. We do have some other things scheduled but we think we can move them.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove, in terms of tomorrow's schedule, we will continue to go today for another 15, 20 minutes, but resuming tomorrow at 9:00, would that be possible?

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: So let me see if there is another, someone else who wishes to speak, come on up.

I am here because I'm one of the supporters of Mr. Eddy Alexandre. I am one of the investors. When I got included in the investment with Mr. Alexandre, I was so happy because making \$8 an hour, and able to investing in a business

where if you invest something you can get something at least would help me with my income, I was so happy and feel blessed.

Mr. Alexandre is very transparency. He would come out on Thursday telling us everything that happened in the business for the whole week. He will tell us everything that he could. We used to get paid every Friday. It was our choice to either we invest or cash out. So when we cash, when I cashed my money, I would get it right away. And I was so happy with that. And it is not only me, it is my family, my friends, and most of the people with the green colors.

This is not the first time we come here and then fill up five rooms. It has been since the beginning, as I am sure you guys already know about it. So we always come here to supporting Mr. Alexandre because he has helping us out just to change our life. At this moment we come in a way where we used to be one. Now for some reason we are divided with certain group and they have their own plan, like my brother just said, because of the lawsuit. So as of right now, we are talking me as a woman, there is a lot of threat because we not with them, we stick with Mr. Alexandre because we believe on what we heard and we had before and with the business. Mr. Alexandre never talked to one of us. If we come here from Florida, Canada, all over, it is our choice because we would appreciate him with what he used to do for us with EminiFX. So we came here just to supporting him, your Honor, just to let you know and insist

how appreciate, how we want him at least to have his life back, and we just believed that he was out with EminiFX to help us out with his heart.

He is a father. He is an honest person. He is a -he has what they call human inside of him. He is an open
person. He loves people. He will help you even you don't know
who you are. That just happens. So we are here to supporting
him and we will continue supporting him, your Honor, with all
heart.

I don't know, this is my first time been coming to court and been coming from Florida, and I said I will consider coming because I know when you are honest with yourself and you know why you are out to help people, God will say something.

My honor, I know. The decision, it is in your hands. We are here to supporting him and we hope you understand and you hear our voice and make the decision.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Before I hear from Mr. Alexandre, is there anyone else in the courtroom who wishes to speak? Go ahead.

And I do ask people, I remind you that comments should be discussing the criminal activity here as this is a sentencing proceeding.

MS. MOMPREMIER: Hello, everyone. Thank you for

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

giving me this opportunity to speak. My name is Ermine, E-R-M-I-N-E, last name M-O-M-P-R-E-M-I-E-R.

I am here, your Honor. I worked all night. I have not slept for over 22 hours. I came from work, I drove to Kentucky to take a flight to come here to support Eddy Alexandre. Why? It is because when I left Haiti, I didn't have anything. I came here alone with the Lord and I manage to become a nurse. It was very hard and it was still hard because I have a lot of siblings in Haiti. I'm talking about 14 of them. And I had to do everything for everybody, including my parents.

When Eddy Alexandre came up with this idea and I became aware of it and I invested, and it was the best thing that could happen to me, my life, and my family in Haiti. I was able to help more and I was able to put them in a better place that I have done before. So, it is very hard to see the good things that was making us happy, turning out that other people sad. He said he was going to give us 5 percent. 5 percent. And if he gave us the 5 percent, but if the market is good, and then he will give us more. So, I, every Friday -- I mean Thursday, after the meeting and I hear everything that he is saying. Everything, he put it out. He said when the market is red, when it is green. You know certain things, you know that maybe sometimes you don't understand but as a trader you know and what he always tell us the truth and people us what is

going on.

We are human. Things happen, we fall or whatever, but my Honor, I am here, like I said, not sleeping. I have to go back to work tomorrow and I am asking you to please take into consideration that we pouring our heart and soul to you because we know that you -- God has the last say but you are here and you are going to make that decision, and I am asking the Lord to please help you to make the right decision, and I thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak? OK, Mr. Alexandre, you may speak.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

Since I am speaking after the victims, I would like to take the opportunity to apologize to the victims and specially mention them by name Mr. Guilliaume, the second victim Mr. Baptiste, Mr. L'Roventure, Ms. Deroe, Ms. Mompremier, and anyone who didn't have a chance to speak at this time. I would like to acknowledge them and I apologize deeply for their losses.

Dear Honorable Judge, I wrote some notes because I did not want to miss anyone --

THE COURT: If it is easier since you are tall, for you to be closer to the microphone, you can sit while you speak to me, too, if that is more convenient.

THE DEFENDANT: I will try. I like to stand for your

11,100,100

Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

THE DEFENDANT: Dear Honorable Judge Cronan: When I embark on this journey, I left my career behind. I was a very happy man, like the prosecutor said. I had a dream. I never imagined I would be here today in that situation and that settings. I am standing here today only to express my deepest remorse and to humbly request leniency with regard to my conviction.

I fully acknowledge the gravity of my actions and take full responsibility for the consequences they have brought upon myself and those that I hold dear who entrusted me with these decisions.

First and foremost, I want to express my sincere apologies to the Court and to all those who have been affected by my actions. I understand the pain that — the disappointment, and disruption that my behavior has caused, especially to my family and friends. My love for my family runs deep and it pains me to see the hurt and the way my actions have caused them — the hurt my actions have caused them.

I assure you, your Honor, that this experience has been a wake-up call for me. It has allowed me to reflect on the choices I have made and the impact they have had on the EminiFX investors and my loved ones. I am committed to making

amends, not only by accepting the consequences imposed by the Court today or tomorrow, but also by actively seeking to better myself and contribute positively to society. I recognize the need for personal growth and rehabilitation and I am dedicated to continue to utilizing any resources or opportunities available to me for that purpose.

My family and friends have been my rock throughout this ordeal. Their love, support, and forgiveness have been invaluable to me. I realize the burden they have had to bear and the sacrifices they have made day after day for the past 14 months on my behalf. I mean to repay their faith in me by working towards becoming all that they see in me, mending the bonds that have been strained and being a responsible and law-abiding member of society.

Your Honor, I humbly request your leniency not as an attempt to evade the consequences of my actions but as an effort to rebuild my life and continue the journey of redemption. I understand the importance of accountability and rehabilitation. I assure you that I will diligently comply with any terms and conditions set forth by the Court. I am committed to making the most of this chance and proving myself deserving your trust.

Once again, I express my deepest remorse for the pain and disappointment I have caused. I am sincerely sorry and I hope that my family and the Court can find it in their hearts

to forgive me. I am ready to take responsibility for any actions and strive towards a better future.

In closing, thank you for considering my request for leniency. I am grateful for the opportunity to express myself to the Court and to the members, to the victims, and my loved ones, and for the fair and just proceedings of this Court.

If given the chance, I am committed to making positive changes and becoming a law-abiding citizen who can contribute meaningfully to society. Respectfully yours, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Alexandre.

Since I thought speakers might have gone a little longer and since it is 5:00 now, I assume the preference would be to proceed to sentencing at this point, Mr. Folly?

MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove?

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge. Thank you.

Is there any reason from the parties that sentence should not be imposed at this point?

MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor.

MR. BOVE: No, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I will ask everyone to bear with me again, I want to step back to the robing room and think about everything that's been said this afternoon and I will be back out in a few minutes.

(Recess)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I will start by explaining the factors I have considered in arriving at Mr. Alexandre's sentence.

First, as required, I have considered the advisory guidelines range which, if not for the statutory maximum, would be 210 to 262 months' imprisonment, because of the 10-year statutory maximum is effectively 100 months in prison, as I mentioned earlier.

Under the Supreme Court's decision in Booker and the cases that have followed it, that guidelines range is only one factor that I must consider in arriving at the appropriate I also must require the factor set forth in United States Section 3553(a)., those factors including the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant, the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense, the need for the sentence to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, and to provide the defendant with needed education or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. must consider the kinds of sentences available, the guidelines range, any pertinent policy statement, the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar crime and

conduct, and the need to provide restitution for victims of the offense. And also, under Section 3553(a) I must impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of sentencing. I have given substantial thought and consideration and attention to each of these factors in arriving at Mr. Alexandre's sentence.

Eddy Alexandre orchestrated a massive investment fraud that victimized thousands of individuals out of approximately \$50 million. The tremendously serious nature of this offense is the most important consideration in my mind today. I will therefore begin with Mr. Alexandre's offense conduct, and in doing so consider nature and circumstances of his offense, as well as the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of that offense and to provide just punishment for it.

Mr. Alexandre founded EminiFX in September 2021. In the roughly eight months that followed until his arrest in May 2022, he defrauded tens of thousands of investors, predominantly members of Haitian community and members of his church, who invested over \$248 million with EminiFX. He promised massive returns assuring investors returns of at least 5 percent each week and possibly up to 9.99 percent. That meant investors could see their money double within five months. The promise of such a return may seem unrealistic but Mr. Alexandre's investors believed in him and trusted him. He was an admired member of the Haitian community, he was seen as

a man of integrity and faith, and investors trusted EminiFX with their money. But, in truth, EminiFX was a fraudulent scheme.

The primary way that Mr. Alexandre was able to convince investors to put their hard-earned money into EminiFX was by telling them that he had this amazing secret technology called robo-advisor assisted account. EminiFX advertised its sophisticated trading functions on its website. Each investor supposedly would receive a fully-serviced robo-advisor assisted account and AI software. That technology, according to Mr. Alexandre, would allow for investors to earn passive income through automated investments in cryptocurrency and foreign exchange trading. That is how those outsized returns supposedly would be generated, but in reality, Mr. Alexandre never had that robo-advisor assisted account up and running. This special secret technology did not exist.

In addition, Mr. Alexandre reported false return on investment figures to investors. He would report to investors that he had secured the promised returns but did not disclose to investors that they in fact were suffering substantial trading losses. All of this was to bring more investments into his company and keep investors with his company. The fraud extended over several months and it entailed Mr. Alexandre employing sophisticated methods, it entailed him working to enlist more and more investors. It entailed weekly investor

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

calls, it entailed creating incentives for investors to bring in more people. Existing investors received commissions from recruiting others to join in EminiFX. This was not a one-time transgression, it cannot be regarded as an isolated or rash decision. This was a calculated, planned, and ongoing fraud. And the reach of the fraud was vast, it was approximately 25,000 victims. Thousands of lives were damaged. those victims cannot afford to lose their money they invested. A lot of the investors, it is clear, invested much of their life savings. We heard that today. In fact, one of the investors who wrote a letter in support of Mr. Alexandre said that she, quote, trusted Mr. Alexandre with all my life savings knowing that he will invest it and give me a good return. Another woman who met Mr. Alexandre at her church also wrote in support of Mr. Alexandre and said that she had invested her family's money in their 401-k with EminiFX. It seems that this person was perhaps receiving either weekly returns or notification of weekly returns and it is not clear to me from her letter that she even appreciated that the fraud -- she even appreciates now that the fraud was taking place. And I heard from some supporters of Mr. Alexandre today who talked about their weekly 5 percent or more returns. But the money just wasn't there and it wasn't there because this was, in essence, a massive Ponzi scheme.

The government also submitted various letters from

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

victims of this fraud discussing the significant harm they suffered. One victim wrote that Mr. Alexandre used people's weaknesses such as God and the Bible to lure them in and ultimately rob them of our hard-earned money. He wrote: My family lost over a half million dollars in this Ponzi scheme. Mr. Alexandre destroyed family. Another wrote how he was completely blindsided by Mr. Alexandre's charisma and ruse when that individual, along with his family and friends, threw their support behind him.

Two of his victims spoke today, at least two people who appreciated they were victims spoke today. Mr. Guilliaume invested his hard-earned life savings. Mr. Baptiste, another hard-working man, invested \$25,000 in the scheme. saving for a home. These were real victims, about 25,000 of them; families, hard-working families, people like Mr. Guilliaume and Mr. Baptiste, people who lost, in total, upwards of \$50 million in their investments and they lost that because they were deceived by Mr. Alexandre. Maybe it is true that Mr. Alexandre was hoping to make a profit for his There is some indication that he was working to investors. make his company succeed by hiring an employee to work on a coding model and another to help on foreign exchange and investment training. But Mr. Alexandre was over his head. had no experience as an investment manager and regardless of all of that, it does not change the simple fact that he was

lying to his investors about his company's technological capabilities and the investment returns that were coming in and that they should expect. And these lies caused many people to lose a lot of money. I am also troubled because there was every indication that this fraud would only have continued if it were not disrupted by law enforcement and the CFTC action. Mr. Alexandre was actively recruiting more investors, he was receiving more and more funds. The fraud only ended because it was forced to end. Maybe Mr. Alexandre would have tried to continue to try to dig his way out but I have no reason to believe that he would have stopped lying to his investors unless law enforcement stepped in.

I also am not convinced that greed had nothing to do with this crime. Perhaps part of his motivation was to provide this community with investment opportunities but I do believe that avarice did come into play, as well as ambition. Some of the fraudulent proceeds went towards a multi-million dollar home in Long Island for Mr. Alexandre's family. While there is an argument as to the status of the other foreclosure properties in Long Island and whether those were investments for EminiFX, that certainly cannot be said for the \$4.8 million home, nor can it be said for the BMW that he used for himself.

I have considered as well other sentences for analogous conduct. The defendants point to my prior sentence of Adam Rojas for financial fraud and, without question,

Mr. Rojas committed a very serious fraud but very different from here.

Here we have a massive number of individual victims. We have sophisticated means employed by Mr. Alexandre. We have Mr. Alexandre taking advantage of the trust that his community placed in him and I do find this conduct considerably more egregious that Mr. Rojas'. At the same time, while the Jaramillo case may be more analogous to Mr. Alexandre's conduct in that the defendant there targeted a sophisticated investors in the community, it does seem to that the defendant or that Mr. Jaramillo used considerably more of the defrauded funds for his own personal benefit and that defendant received a 144-month sentence which, obviously, is higher than the maximum here.

Now, I do find the guidelines range helpful here in arriving at the appropriate sentence. The U.S. Sentencing Commission has set a guidelines range for this conduct that would be 210 to 252 months. The effective range in this case, of course, is much lower, it is 120 months. But the statutory maximum for Count One, that maximum is 7.5 years below the bottom of the range the commission established for this conduct if it were not for a statutory maximum.

I also find the loss amount that gave rise to that offense level to be appropriate. It is a value of funds that investors were defrauded into investing. Even if I were to

just look at the amount of funds investors in fact lost, which to be clear I don't think is the appropriate consideration, even that figure would trigger a guidelines range above the statutory maximum here, it would be a range of 135 to 168 months. On top of that, I think it is worth noting that the offense level here includes a two-level enhancement for 10 or more victims under Section 2B1.1(b)(2)(A)(i). There are 250,000 victims here. Without question, this was an exceedingly serious offense. At the same time, I note that for the offense Mr. Alexandre pled guilty to, Congress has set a statutory maximum of 120 months' imprisonment.

I will also discuss some of the other Section 3553(a) factors. In particular, let me address the need for deterrence for Mr. Alexandre and others and for the sentence to promote respect for the law and to protect the public from future crimes for the defendant.

As for individual deterrence and the need to protect society from future crimes by the defendant, I note that Mr. Alexandre does not have a criminal history. There is no information suggesting that he violated the law in the past or that he posed a danger to society prior to committing this offense, and as I will discuss more in a moment, very much the opposite seems to be the case. There is considerable information before me including from the many letters submitted on Mr. Alexandre's behalf that he has been someone who helps

others, who has had a positive impact in his community, this fraud notwithstanding, and that he is someone who is supportive of his family and friends. But, as I mentioned before, at the same time this was not a one-time transgression. Mr. Alexandre only stopped committing the fraud because he was arrested and that the parties acknowledge the defendant attempted to dissipate \$100,000 that should have gone to victims after he was arrested in this case. There is some degree of need for specific deterrence here.

There also is considerable need for general deterrence. People in society must realize that the commission of such massive investment schemes have real victims, and when that happens there will be real consequences. There is a value for would-be fraudsters to note that if they choose to engage in fraud, they may be caught and face serious consequences. And economic-based fraud that requires sophistication, planning and deliberation, such as the crime here, is the sort of more rational and calculated crime for which general deterrence is likely to have a stronger impact?

I touched on Mr. Alexandre's history and characteristics a bit earlier but let me say some more about that. Mr. Alexandre was raised in challenging conditions in Haiti. He grew up in a neighborhood impacted by poverty and violence. He had a loving upbringing with his family but they did struggle for food. As a child and a young man he witnessed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

crime and violence in Haiti, and then he emigrated to the United States in 1998 and became a legal permanent resident. By all accounts, he has been a productive member of society in our country and in Haiti until his commission of this crime. He secured an excellent education in Haiti. I understand that he received a bachelors degree in computer programming and accounting from the University of Adventist in Haiti, and that he further pursued college studies in economics at another University in Haiti. He has held excellent jobs in information technology and computer software both here in the U.S. and in Haiti. He operated two different companies focused on mortgage, real estate, and information technology services. worked for a security protection company in Long Island, he was a senior network engineer and senior architect for HBO, and even as this case has been pending, he secured a very good job as director of operations for an irrigation company in Long Island. Yet, as with several of the considerations in this case, this cuts both ways.

Mr. Alexandre is different than any of the criminal defendants who appear before me. While he grew up in difficult and challenging conditions in Haiti, he has a loving family. He was fortunate to receive a very good education. He held excellent jobs. He was taking advantage of the many opportunities that our country gave him. He was successful. He did not have to resort to this criminal activity. He was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not desperate to put food on the table. His motivation was not financial desperation. It may have been, in part, to help his community invest, but also it was for him to make more money.

Now, on the topic of his community, I have received a massive number of letters in support of Mr. Alexandre. They come from family members, from members of the community, from members of his church, from many EminiFX investors. As I alluded to earlier, it seems like that from these letters, many of those investors believe they were making money thanks to Mr. Alexandre reflecting the returns or notification of their These letters -- and I believe the defense has submitted roughly 500, totaling over 750 pages -- over and over again discuss, speak of Mr. Alexandre in very high terms. There are some common themes in those letters:

He is a devoted husband and loving father.

He is a leader in the Haitian community.

He is a leader and quiding member of his church, a man of faith.

He is committed to service.

He volunteers and delivers food at food drives.

He tries to help others.

He is viewed as an honest and trustworthy man and a man of integrity and dignity.

He is a skilled musician who will play for free at weddings and church functions.

He is a reliable friend and a mentor to the young.

And today, I believe we have three overflow courtrooms from what I am told, and each of them are full.

there are some specific concrete examples of his charitable efforts in the community:

He formed a non-profit Reform-Haiti in 2012 to improve Haitian access to healthcare.

In 2013 he visited Haiti with medical supplies to be distributed.

In 2014 he started a youth mentorship program in Queens.

According to Mr. Alexandre's brother-in-law, in 2000 he implemented a program in the Flatbush community to encourage young people to stay in school and he has mentored young people in the community.

He is a chaplain in his church.

He works with church attendees in need including their physical, mental, and social needs

He has done various work at North Shore hospital with ill patients and their families. He facilitated the pickup and delivery of groceries and prescription medication for elderly or sick members of the community. He helped people who were suffering from COVID 19 during the pandemic.

But this all also cuts in another direction, too. It seems to me that the overwhelming majority of Mr. Alexandre's

victims were members of the Haitian community and/or his church. Many of those victims, including I am sure many of the people in the court house today, looked up to him and placed their trust in him when they invested their hard-earned money with EminiFX. They did that because they trusted him and they trusted his promises of huge investment returns. One of the investors who wrote in support of Mr. Alexandre wrote that EminiFX created hope in the hearts of Haitian families. This was a close-knit and trusting community. Mr. Alexandre was strongly admired. That resonated in the letters I received and in some of the people who spoke today.

The owner of what I believe is the company that the defendant now works at described Mr. Alexandre as a man of God, a man of his word, a great leader. Mr. Alexandre is a hero in our community.

Another letter written by a minister who invested in EminiFX wrote, When I have heard about EminiFX and the Haitian community, my first question was who is the CEO? And when I knew it was Mr. Eddy Alexandre, I did not ask a second question because I knew that Mr. Alexandre was a man of integrity and vision.

Another investor said he invested with confidence knowing that Eddy is a trustworthy person who always kept his word. Yet another investor wrote when I told my husband about EminiFX, he shared with me that since Eddy is the leader, he

would be on board. We trust him and know he would never steer us wrong.

That was a trust that Mr. Alexandre had in the community. Those are words coming from his supporters but he did steer them wrong. He betrayed that trust and that trust only contributed to the huge magnitude of this fraud. The investment on returns that the defendant promised seemed absurd and unrealistic, between 5 and 9.9 percent week, but these investors believed in him. They believed in him as a trusted member of the church and as a respected person in the Haitian community and they trusted him with their hard-earned money.

Another investor, for instance, wrote to me also in support of Mr. Alexandre, but what he said showed how so many people were deceived. He wrote: We live in a world where dishonesty is in full swing, we can trust nobody. However, among the rules there is an exception. Eddy Alexandre, our CEO, is an exception. He is a man of integrity, a man of character, a man of God. That investor was receiving the promised returns on Friday, but in actuality, investors were suffering massive losses and I suspect many of the victims likewise thought that Mr. Alexandre was someone they could trust.

Now, with all of that said, Mr. Alexandre has accepted responsibility for his crime. He entered a guilty plea at a relatively early stage of this case, especially for a case of

this size and magnitude. It appears that, for the most part, he has been cooperative with the receiver in a civil case helping the receiver to recover funds from the victim of the offense. I mention, of course, in this instance where he tried to dissipate funds. But putting that instance aside, the receiver has reported favorably on Mr. Alexandre's cooperation to secure assets including stipulating to turn over certain assets and providing a list of accounts, and the receiver noted that this helped reduce recovery costs. That included access to his Coinbase account. But notwithstanding these efforts, it is clear that victims of this offense are not likely to be made whole.

I have also considered the impact of the sentence on Mr. Alexandre's immigration status and his family including the possibility of separation from his family after he completes his sentence. I have considered these mitigating circumstances but I also must consider the extremely serious nature of this crime, I must consider the nearly 25,000 victims who were defrauded out of nearly \$50 million of their hard-earned money. I must consider the massive nature of this fraud.

I will now state the sentence I intend to impose.

Mr. Alexandre, will you please rise. Mr. Alexandre, it is the judgment of this Court that you are remanded to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for 108 months. That federal term of imprisonment is to be followed by a period of three years of

supervised release. I conclude that the sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the purposes of sentencing for the reasons I just went through and if you like, you may be seated while I read the conditions of supervised release that you must comply with.

The standard conditions of supervised release shall apply. Those are on pages 51 and 52 of the presentence report. Mr. Bove and Mr. Alexandre, would you like me to read those out loud?

MR. BOVE: That's not necessary, your Honor.

THE COURT: If anyone would like me to read them out loud, I will, but otherwise I assume that Mr. Alexandre and the attorneys have read them, given that everyone has stated that they read the presentence report.

In addition, you will be subject to the following mandatory conditions:

You must not commit another federal, state, or local crime.

You must not illegally possess a controlled substance.

I will suspend the drug testing condition based on my determination that you pose a low risk of future substance abuse.

You must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer

You also must make restitution, which I will address

shortly.

You also must meet certain special conditions of supervised release and I will explain the special conditions that I will impose. You must provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information. You must not incur any new credit card charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless you are in compliance with the installment payment schedule. You must submit your person and any property, residence, vehicle, papers, computer, other electronic communications, data storage devices, cloud storage or media and effects to a search by any U.S. probation officer and, if needed, with the assistance of any law enforcement. The search will be conducted when there is a reasonable suspicion concerning the violation of condition of supervision or unlawful conduct by you.

Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation of release and you shall warrant any other residents of the premises that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to that condition, and any search shall be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

You also shall be supervised in the district of your residence during a term of supervised release.

Restitution is mandatory in this case. In addition, in your plea agreement you agreed to make restitution in an

amount to be specified by me and that it will be a condition of your supervised release.

As discussed earlier, I will order restitution in the amount of \$213,829,276.73 today, with the understanding that the parties may come back within 90 days, which I believe would be October 16th, 2023, with the proposed restitution order and table of victims. At that point they also should advise whether the restitution figure I have just said should be adjusted.

You shall make restitution payments by certified check, bank check, money order, wire transfer, credit card, or cash. The check and money order shall be made payable to SDNY Clerk of Court and mailed or hand-delivered to the U.S. Court House, 500 Pearl Street, New York, New York, attention:

Cashier. You shall write your name and docket number of this case on each check or money order. Credit card payments must be made in person at the Clerk's office. Any cash payments to be hand-delivered to the clerk's office with exact change, cannot be mailed. For payments by wire you shall contact the Clerk's office for wire any instructions.

The Clerk of the Court will forward any restitution payments made by Mr. Alexandre to the victims. Pursuant to Section 3664(f)(2) of Title 18 in consideration of your financial resources and other assets, including whether any of those assets are jointly owned, the projected earnings and

other income, and any financial obligations you have including obligations to dependents, you shall pay restitution in the manner and according to the following schedule:

In the interest of justice, restitution shall be payable in installments pursuant to 18 U.S.C.

Section 3572(d)(1) and (2). While serving your term of imprisonment, you shall make installment payments towards your restitution obligation and you may do so to the Bureau of Prisons Inmate Financial Responsibility Plan.

Pursuant to Bureau of Prisons policy, the Bureau of Prisons may establish a payment plan by evaluating your six-month deposit history and subtracting any amount determined by the Bureau of Prisons to be used to maintain contact with family and friends. The remaining balance may be used to determine your payment schedule. Bureau of Prisons staff shall help you develop a financial plan and monitor your progress in meeting your restitution obligation. Upon your release from prison, any unpaid restitution will be paid in monthly installments of at least 15 percent of your gross income but not less than \$300 per month and payable on the 7th of the month.

I have considered the factors in Section 3664(f)(2) in formulating that payment schedule. You shall notify, within 30 days, the Clerk of the Court, U.S. Probation Office during supervised release, and U.S. Attorney's office at 86 Chambers

Street, New York, New York, of any change of your name, residence, or mailing address, and any material change in your financial resources that affect your ability to pay restitution. If you disclose or the government otherwise learns of additional assets not known to the government at the time of my restitution order, the government may seek an order modifying the payment schedule consistent with discovery or additional assets. Your liability to pay restitution shall terminate on the day no later than 20 years from the entry of judgment or 20 years from your release from prison. Subject to those limitations, in the event of your death, your estate will be responsible for any unpaid bail and the restitution amount and any lien filed pursuant to Section 3613(c) shall continue until the estate receives a written release of that liability.

You also shall pay interest on any restitution amount of more than 2,500 unless restitution is paid in full before the 15th day after this judgment.

In your plea agreement you also admitted the forfeiture allegation in the indictment as to Count One and I entered the content preliminary order of forfeiture. So that the record is clear you are ordered to forfeit to the United States, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. Section 2461(c), a sum of money equal to \$ -- a sum of money equal to \$248,829,276.73 in U.S. currency which represents the proceeds traceable to the commission of this

offense as well as all right, title, and interest you have in the following specific property:

A BMW vehicle with VIN WBAGX0C17NCH48894.

A Mercedes Benz GLS 450 vehicle with VIN 4JGFF5KE4NA710045.

TD Bank accounts held in the name of EminiFX with account numbers ending in 0637, 2914, 2922, 8473, 8598, 8697, and 9920.

TD Bank accounts held in the name of the defendant with account numbers ending in 5365 and 2539.

Bank of America accounts held in the name of EminiFX with account numbers ending in 3746 and 3742.

A Genisys Credit Union account held in the name of the defendant with account number ending in 9223.

Interactive Brokers accounts held in the name of the defendant with account numbers ending in 1114 and 1937.

Square accounts in the name of EminiFX and/or the defendant with account numbers ending in pyls, pykp, 8y62, 3VA3, and CXPF.

A Coinbase account held in the name of the defendant with account number ending in -0f09.

A Gemini account held in the name of the defendant with account number ending in -2849.

I am not going to impose a fine because I find that it would interfere with your ability to pay restitution and

forfeiture. I do impose a mandatory special assessment of \$100 which shall be due immediately.

Mr. Bove, is there a designation request from the defense?

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge. We would ask for designation as close as possible to the northeast so that Mr. Alexandre can visit his family.

THE COURT: I will make that recommendation. Of course, it will be at the determination of the Bureau of Prisons but I will recommend that he be designated to a facility in the northeast as close as possible to the New York City area.

Aside from all the issues raised today, does either counsel know of any legal reason why the sentence shall not be imposed, as stated?

MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor. No legal reason. We would just note, I believe your Honor in describing the offense conduct at one point, you referenced there being 250,000 victims. I understand you meant 25,000 victims, but just for purposes of clarity on the record.

THE COURT: Thank you. I very well may have misspoke. If I did, I certainly meant 25,000 and not 250,000. Thank you for pointing that out, Mr. Folly. As discussed throughout today's proceeding, the number of victims was approximately 25,000.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And Mr. Bove, other than the issues you have raised already, is there any legal reason why the sentence should not be imposed, as stated? MR. BOVE: No, Judge. Thank you. THE COURT: I order the sentence I have described to be imposed, as stated. I find that the sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to satisfy the sentencing purposes of 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a)(2), including the need to promote respect for the law, provide just punishment for the offense, and to afford adequate deterrence to the defendant and to others, and to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant. There was a second count in the indictment, does the government move to dismiss that count? MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor. We so move at this time. THE COURT: I will dismiss any open counts, including but not limited to the second count of the indictment. Have the parties discussed a voluntary surrender date? MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, the government is seeking remand and would ask to be heard at this time. THE COURT: OK. Mr. Bove, are you prepared to address that at this time?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, there is two primary reasons

Yes, your Honor.

MR. BOVE:

THE COURT: Mr. Folly.

that remand is appropriate here. The first is in light of the substantial sentence that your Honor just imposed of 108 months, there is a substantial risk of flight for this defendant.

Throughout these proceedings, your Honor, there has been a number of references to the defendant's likely or near certain removal to Haiti, a country he has indicated he clearly does not wish to return to. The defendant, in light of the sentence imposed by your Honor here today, has every incentive to flee at this juncture as opposed to waiting to serve out a sentence — a substantial sentence of 108 months, and then being removed.

Your Honor, in addition to that, the second significant reason that favors remand here, and of course as your Honor knows at this juncture there is a presumption, but the second reason is that the defendant's conduct while on bail in this case, much of which has only surfaced in the last several days, demonstrates his willingness to disregard Court orders and to take actions that are contrary to the law. For example, as your Honor cited during your sentencing remarks, the defendant dissipated \$100,000 in assets of investors. What is particularly troubling about that \$100,000 is that that happened after the defendant made representations at various bail proceedings that there were no assets, that all the assets had been subsumed within the various actions on behalf of the

government, and the CFTC, and we now know that was not true, he did have access to a substantial sum of money, and that's the kind of money that could easily get used to assist the defendant in fleeing.

Your Honor, putting those two facts together, there is a significant risk of flight in this case. There is not sufficient evidence that this defendant is not going to flee and for that reason we seek remand.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove.

MR. BOVE: Judge, this man has no ability to flee. He doesn't have the funds to do it, he doesn't have a passport. It is inconceivable on this record. I said it in my submission and I will say it out loud, the only place on earth that Eddy wants to be is in his home for as long as you let him, until he is designated.

I talked to Eddy this morning at about 12:30 a.m. when I saw the government's submission last night, and we talked about what was in it and we talked about the truth and we agreed that we would come here and accept responsibility for that, knowing the consequences that would follow from that acknowledgment.

He showed up, Judge. And he will continue to show up as he has throughout this case. He is going to serve his sentence. And we would ask that he be permitted to surrender once he is designated.

THE COURT: Are there additional conditions that you would propose given the additional risk of flight that there is now given that he has been sentenced?

MR. BOVE: Whatever the Court thinks is necessary, obviously. What is paramount to him is his ability to spend meaningful time with his family, ideally not under a home incarceration or home detention condition that limits him to his house. Judge, these are his final experiences with these kids. He came here today knowing that. He said good-bye to them when he left. He is going to serve his sentence. He just wants a chance to surrender.

THE COURT: Given that there has not been issues brought to my attention during his pretrial release and to the extent that any were raised in the presentence report we addressed them today, and there at least seemed to be a misunderstanding to some extent, I am not going to order Mr. Alexandre remanded today. I will set a voluntary surrender date. With that said, though, if there are any issues during his supervision pending that voluntary surrender date, I would want to know about that immediately.

In terms of voluntary surrender date, how much time would the parties propose, Mr. Folly?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, again, I think considering there is no change in his bail conditions being imposed and the significant risk of flight we just outlined, we would propose

that it is the earliest practicable date.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove, 30 days?

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: I will set a voluntary surrender date in 30 days. I believe if he is not designated by the Bureau of Prisons to an institution by then he would report to the marshals in this building but I'm not entirely sure as to how that would work. So Mr. Bove, please look into that. 30 days would bring us to August 17th, so why don't we do it that Friday, August 18, 2023.

Mr. Alexandre, I also advise you that you have the right to appeal from the judgment imposing a sentence to whatever extent you haven't waived it. If you are unable to pay for the cost of appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. If that application were granted, you would be permitted to appeal without payment of fees. Any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the judgment of conviction.

I know that this is a long sentence. I do hope when you are released from prison and while you are in prison you are able to live a productive life going forward. It is certainly evident that you have many people who care about you, Mr. Alexandre, very, very much, and I do hope you are able to have a positive impact on society.

Please bear in mind that when you are released from

prison, I don't know what is going to happen in terms of your 1 2 immigration situation, that is something outside of my control, 3 but if you are on supervised release you must take those conditions of supervised release seriously. If you violate 4 5 supervised release you most likely will be before me again, in 6 which case if there is a violation I may send you back to 7 prison which is certainly not what I would want to happen. 8 Mr. Folly, is there anything further from the 9 government? 10 MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Bove? 12 MR. BOVE: No, Judge. And we appreciate the time. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. 14 I hope everyone has a good evening. 15 000 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25